DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 131 933 PS 008 952

AUTHOR	Rodes, Thomas W.
TITLE	National Childcare Consumer Study: 1975. Volume III: American Consumer Attitudes and Opinions on Child Care.
INSTITUTION	Unco, Inc., Washington, D.C.
SPONS AGENCY	Office of Child Development (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	75
CONTRACT	HEW-105-74-1107
NOTE	303p.; For other volumes of this study, see PS 008 950-953; Some tables may reproduce poorly
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.83 HC-$16.73 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Child Care; Child Care Centers; Cultural Factors; *Day Care Services; Economic Disadvantagement; Elementary School Students; Family Day Care; Family Environment; Family Structure; Government Role; Infants; Interviews; Junior High School Students; Mothers; *National Demography; *National Surveys; *Parent Attitudes; Preschool Children; Problems; Questionnaires; Race; Research Design; Research Methodology; Selection; Socioeconomic Background; *Statistical Data; Working Parents

ABSTRACT

This report represents the third of a series of analyses of child care usages based on 4609 personal interviews conducted in 1975 from a national probability sample of households with children under 14 years of age. The study was sponsored by the office of Child Development of the U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare. This volume is devoted to an analysis of the preferences, opinions and attitudes of current and potential child-care consumers. Data are organized under the following headings: (1) Introduction and Design Summary, (2) Reasons for Using Care, (3) Satisfaction and Preferences, (4) Factors Influencing Selection, Change and Discontinuance, (5) Attitude on Working Mothers, (6) The Public Role. (MS)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

P3

NATIONAL CHILDCARE CONSUMER STUDY: 1975

ED131933

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

VOLUME III

AMERICAN CONSUMER ATTITUDES AND PREFERENCES ON CHILDCARE

PS 008952

prepared under contract #105-74-1107 for:

Office of Child Development
U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare

ED131933

NATIONAL CHILDCARE CONSUMER STUDY: 1975

VOLUME III

American Consumer Attitudes and Opinions On Child Care

Thomas W. Rodes
Principal Author and Analyst

John C. Moore
Project Manager

Prepared under Contract # HEW-105-74-1107

for

Office of Child Development

Department of Health, Education, and Welfare

PS 008952

Opinions expressed herein are those of Unco, Inc., and should not be construed to represent the opinions or policies of any agency, department, or other instrument of any federal, state, or local government.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The National Child Care Consumer Study is the work of many persons both within and outside of Unco, Inc. The instrument was developed with the assistance of Victoria Squier and Elizabeth Diffendal of the Unco staff, with the expert consultation of David Orr and the thoughtful help and direction of Patricia Hawkins and William Diepenbrock of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare. We are also indebted to the many reviewers in the government and in academia who contributed suggestions and comments during the study design phase.

The data were collected by Chilton Research Services under the direction of William Oldach. Fred Soulas, Carmela Linsalata, Ruth Finkle, and Dale Kulp of the Chilton staff also played important roles in the field work.

Elizabeth Diffendal, Ann-Therese Leney and Susan Jones of the Unco staff made vital contributions to the analysis. Sam Granato and Louis Bates of the Office of Child Development were very helpful in providing agency input to the analysis.

Finally, we are grateful to Betty Heydon for excellent typing and production assistance, sometimes running well into the early morning hours, and to William Darnell, President of Unco, for his technical support and management assistance throughout the study.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

SECTION I: INTRODUCTION AND DESIGN SUMMARY

Overview 1-1
Highlights 1-2

SECTION II: REASONS FOR USING CARE

Households Using Care: A Review 2-1
Reasons for Using 2-5
Disincentives, Guilt and Fears 2-17

SECTION III: SATISFACTION AND PREFERENCES

Satisfaction in General 3-1
Preferences in General 3-5
Attitudes on In-Home Care 3-14
Attitudes on Relatives as Caregivers 3-17
Preferences for Care in Non-Relatives' Homes 3-20
Preferences for Centers and Nursery Schools 3-23
Preferences by Age of Child 3-28

SECTION IV: FACTORS INFLUENCING SELECTION, CHANGE AND DISCONTINUANCE

Discussion 4-1
Past Experience and Change 4-2
Alternative Methods Considered 4-11
Selection Factors 4-15
Least Important Selection Factors 4-21
Cost and Transportation Thresholds 4-26

SECTION V: ATTITUDES ON WORKING MOTHERS

Employed Mothers: A Review 5-1
Attitudes 5-6

SECTION VI: THE PUBLIC ROLE

On Government Involvement Generally 6-1
Funding Priorities 6-7
Adult to Child Ratios 6-22

I. Introduction and Design Summary

Section I

INTRODUCTION AND DESIGN SUMMARY

Overview

This report represents the third of a series of analyses based on 4,609 personal interviews conducted in the late spring and early summer of 1975 from a national probability sample of households with children under 14 years of age. Volume I (Basic Tabulations) provides a full accounting of all the data gathered, including a specimen questionnaire, marginal tabulations and sample dispositions. Volume II (Current Patterns of Child Care Use in the United States) reports the prevalence of usage of the various types of child care, describes the population subgroups who use care, provides an analysis of the patterns and trends of usage and explains, in greater detail than is supplied herein, statistical techniques and the sampling methodology employed.

This volume is devoted to an analysis of the preferences, opinions and attitudes of current and potential child care consumers. The essential perspective is that of all U.S. households containing children under 14.

The study design presupposes two particular population groups of interest—those for whom culture or economic circumstance pose special hardships. Consequently, ethnic minorities and low-income households were intentionally overrepresented in the sample to bolster the capability for analyzing trends within these scarce subgroups. In all cases, however, the probability sample design provided that all respondent households entered the survey with a known probability of selection so that weighting techniques could be employed to preserve an "unbiased" national perspective. Furthermore, the differential weighting results in absolute projections of the number of applicable households in the conterminous United States.

In general, the data portray a very "traditional" portrait of the American family. Over 99% of the respondents (i.e., persons primarily responsible for the care of the children) were females, about 82% of whom were married (spouse present). Most of the households consisted of nuclear families, and only about 2% of the children who were not sons or daughters of respondents. The overall household income distribution was decidedly "middle class" with about 15% (weighted) falling below the poverty level. Roughly a third of the "mothers" were employed.

Although no entering level of knowledge is presumed of the reader of this volume, the serious analyst will no doubt find it helpful to review the sampling design and methodology sections in Volume II. Similarly, those interested in the data collection methodology, particularly the exact phrasing and sequencing of the questions, can examine specimen instruments in Volume I.

Highlights

This volume is organized along five topical themes divided into chapters as follows:

Section II: Reasons for Using Child Care

This chapter begins with a brief review (from Volume II) of the numbers and proportions of households using various types of child care and defines, for the purpose of this report, the term "user" as denoting households using some method of care external to the immediate nuclear family. Considering all child care arrangements, the most important reported reasons for using are a set of adult needs including community activities and simply "going out" (43.6%), parents' work or school (39.4%) and child development or personal growth (10.9%). Consumer attitudes and opinions on the effects of care on children, guilt associated with using care and similar disincentives against using care are explored.

Section III: Satisfaction and Preferences

About nine of ten consumers are "happy" with their current arrangement, although employed mothers and single-parent household heads tended to be somewhat more critical. About one in four users would prefer some other method of care if they could have any type they wanted. About 45% of those wishing to change would prefer day care centers or nursery schools over their current arrangements. Nearly one in three would select care in the child's own home. Only about 3% would prefer Family Day Care Homes.

Section IV: Factors Influencing Selection, Change and Discontinuance

According to consumers, child-oriented program attributes constitute the strongest factors in the selection of care and also in deciding to change arrangements for care. Adult-convenience-oriented factors rank a poor second with cost given as the least important factor. However, costs are subject to distinct upper limits. The median threshold (i.e., the most respondent would pay for child care) is between $20 and $24 per week.

Section V: Attitudes on Working Mothers

Thirty-seven percent of the sample was employed at least part-time. Most (60%) work for "economic survival." About 53% of those who were not employed gave as a reason that they could "contribute more to (their families) as homemaker(s)." There is strong sentiment in the public opinion to the effect that working mothers "miss the best years of their children's lives." One in five respondents felt that "working mothers neglect their children as a result.

Section VI: The Public Role

About one in six respondents opposed any government role in child care programs. In contrast, about a third would be willing to have their taxes raised in order to support child care activities. Public opinion favors, by about four to one, funding providers rather than making direct cash payments to working parents. The sliding fee scale concept as a progressive measure to handle the costs of child care is widely accepted as desirable. The existence of public standards and licensing requirements are highly controversial with respect to care in private homes, but are nearly universally accepted in concept for day care centers and nursery schools.

II. Reasons for Using Child Care

Section II

REASONS FOR USING CARE

Households Using Child Care: A Review

In Volume II of the study it was reported that just under two thirds of all households with children under 14 use some form of child care arrangement involving a caregiver outside the nuclear family.* Tables 2-1 and 2-2 on the following pages present a review of the incidences of usage reported therein for use in this analysis as baseline statistics on users.

One of the most difficult conceptual problems in analyzing attitudes and preferences on child care arises from the lack of a satisfactory way of defining what is meant by the term "user." For example, approximately six percent of children whose parents stated they used some form of child care received care so infrequently as to average less than an hour per week. On the one hand, it could be argued that such very insubstantial cases should be counted as "users" in the analysis of consumer attitudes because the parent has at least some experience with a given type arrangement for care. On the other hand, it could be maintained, equally forcefully, that these households do not really fit our vernacular notion of "user" and do not represent a serious or substantial segment of child care consumption.

---

*Current Patterns of Child Care Use in the United States, Unco, Inc., Arlington, Virginia, February 1976. (See particularly Sections IV and VI.)

TABLE 2-1

Incidences of Child Care Usage by Method of Care

Method of Care	Households Using (Percent of Population)	Households Using as Main Method of Care		Households Using Ten or More Hours/Week (Percent of Population)
		As Percent of "Main Method Users"	As Percent of Population	
In child's home				
By relative	23.7	22.5	14.0	6.0
By non-relative	23.1	20.9	13.0	4.8
In other home				
By relative	31.6	27.2	17.0	7.7
By non-relative	21.1	16.5	10.3	6.2
Nursery schools	7.3	5.8	3.6	2.7
Day care center	2.9	3.6	2.3	1.9
Cooperative program	1.4	0.9	0.6	0.2
Before/after school program	4.4	2.0	1.3	0.7
Headstart	0.4	0.5	0.3	0.3
Base (percent of all households with children under 14)*	(62.3%)	(100.0%)	(62.3%)	(30.5%)

*24.4 million

TABLE 2-2

Distribution of Households Using Care by Main Methods of Care and Age of Youngest Child
(Percent of households)

Main Method	Age of Youngest				All Users	
	2 or under	3 to 5	6 to 9	10 to 13	Number	Percent
In child's home						
by relative	26.1	15.6	25.0	24.5	3,418	22.5
by non-relative	21.6	23.9	19.5	13.5	3,176	20.9
In other home						
by relative	28.4	23.9	24.8	36.5	4,136	27.2
by non-relative	13.8	15.1	22.2	19.0	2,513	16.5
Nursery school	5.7	11.5	0.7	-	874	5.8
Day care center	2.0	7.0	3.5	0.3	550	3.6
Cooperative program	1.6	1.0	0.1	-	139	0.9
Before/after school program	0.6	0.9	4.0	6.2	308	2.0
Headstart	0.3	1.0	0.2	-	71	0.5
All methods						
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	-	
Number*	5,678	4,598	3,131	1,777	15,185	
Percent	37.4	30.3	20.6	11.7	-	100%

Estimated in thousands of households

A similar argument could be made that casual use of informal neighborhood arrangements and care by relatives involving no compensation should not be counted as "usage." But even if we agreed to count only users of "substantial" care or "market arrangements" we would have difficulties arriving at incontrovertible critera.

Also confusing the concept of usage is a rather high incidence of households making multiple arrangements. Approximately 36% of households reporting at least one current arrangement identified two or more methods of care, and this figure is even higher among households including more than one child. Although this phenomenon presents no problem in analyzing patterns of usage, it would be highly confusing (and perhaps controversial) to count a given respondent's opinion more than once because she or he uses more than one method of care.

In order to simplify the problem of multiple perspective, the questionnaire was designed to elicit data on all of the methods of care used by all children within households. Then, respondents were asked to select, from among the methods of care used, one type of care which they considered to be their "main method." The criteria for selection of a main method were undefined allowing the respondent to apply her or his personal standards and perceptions on relative importance. Subsequent questions related to using care were focused on the main method.

Unless otherwise noted in this report, the term "user" denotes a respondent (or household) using a type of care, even if infrequently, involving a caregiver or institution external to the immediate household. Where users are subdivided by types of care used, main methods of care are given and the categories are mutually exclusive (i.e., a respondent cannot have more than one main method).

Reasons for Using

Child care users were asked to give all applicable reasons for using care from a list of reasons constructed on the basis of the questionnaire pretest results and from unstructured group interviews of users. They were also asked to identify a single most important reason (Table 2-3). About two thirds said that they sometimes use care "to go out" (e.g., social, shopping, entertainment activities, etc.). The second most common reason overall and the "most important reason" was "to work, or look for work" (42% and 35%, respectively).

As an aid to interpretation, the taxonomy of reasons can be interpreted as consisting of three basic categories as follows:*

- Work or school related (39.4%)
  - To work or seek work
  - To go to school ("myself")
  - To take job training ("myself")
- Adult-oriented convenience (43.6%)
  - Regular community activities
  - Occasional community activities
  - To "get away from children sometimes"
  - To "go out"
- Child development or socialization (10.9%)
  - To help children learn things for school
  - To help children be independent
  - To help children get along with others

---

*Excluding the "other" and "no reason" categories which are intractable.

TABLE 2-3

Reasons for Using Child Care
(Percent of Users)

Reason	All Reasons Given*	Given as "Most Important Reason"
So that I can work, or look for work	41.9	35.3
So that I can carry on regular community, charitable or volunteer activities	9.5	2.5
So that I can carry on occasional community, charitable or volunteer activities	14.6	2.2
Because I need to get away from children for a while sometimes	28.0	5.8
To help my child learn things he needs for school	13.9	2.8
To teach my child how to be independent	22.0	3.0
To teach my child how to get along with other children	23.0	5.0
So that I can go to school myself	9.5	3.2
So that I can take job training	2.6	0.9
So that I can go out (social, shopping, entertainment activities, etc.)	67.2	33.1
Other, no reason	8.4	6.2
TOTAL	(100.0)	100.0%

*Includes multiple answers

Although the child development class of reasons is important in the distribution of "all reasons given," only about one in ten households said they used care primarily for these reasons.

Most (62%) mothers who were employed full-time used child care in support of work and gave this as their most important reason (Table 2-4). Overall, about 23% of all households with children under 14 use child care primarily in order to work.

Of the various family structures, households headed by divorcees (7% of all households) were by far the most likely to use care for work-related reasons at 52% (Table 2-5). A total of 57% of divorcees used care for either work, school or job training purposes.

The greatest distributional difference can be seen by dichotomizing respondents into the classes married and not married, as shown below:

Type of Reason by Summary
Ma[redacted]

Type of Reason	Married	Not Married
Work/school related	21.2	44.7
Adult convenience	31.9	11.7
Child development	7.6	3.8
None/other	39.4	39.9
	100.0	100.0

TABLE 2-4

Most Important Reason for Using Care by Employment Status

	Employed Full-time		Employed Part-time		Not Employed		All Respondents	
	number	percent	number	percent	number	percent	number	percent
To work or seek work	3,553	61.9	1,432	44.8	578	3.8	5,562	22.9
Regular community activities	4	0.1	18	0.6	402	2.6	425	1.7
Occasional community activities	7	0.1	29	0.9	341	2.2	378	1.6
Get away from children sometimes	48	0.8	97	3.0	772	5.0	916	3.8
Help child learn for school	59	1.0	33	1.0	344	2.2	436	1.8
Help child be independent	22	0.4	25	0.8	417	2.7	465	1.9
Help child get along with others	100	1.7	93	2.9	573	3.7	766	3.2
School (Respondent's)	68	1.2	91	2.9	344	2.2	503	2.1
Job training (Respondent's)	11	0.2	0	0.0	127	0.8	138	0.6
"To go out"	164	2.8	412	12.9	4,579	29.8	5,154	21.2
Other, no care used	1,702	29.7	967	30.2	6,899	44.9	9,567	39.4
Total	5,737	100.0	3,196	100.0	15,375	100.0	24,309	-
Percent of base	-	23.6	-	13.1	-	63.3	-	100.0

TABLE 2-5

Most Important Reason for Using Care by Marital Status

	Married, Spouse Present Number	Married, Spouse Present Percent	Never Married Number	Never Married Percent	Separated Number	Separated Percent	Divorced Number	Divorced Percent	Widowed Number	Widowed Percent	All Respondents Number	All Respondents Percent
To work or seek work	3,893	19.4	244	35.6	389	29.0	892	51.8	139	21.9	5,557	22.8
Regular community activities	391	2.0	3	0.4	9	0.7	10	0.6	11	1.8	425	1.7
Occasional community activities	371	1.9	2	0.3	2	0.2	3	0.2	0	0.0	378	[illegible]
Get away from children sometimes	786	3.9	28	4.1	36	2.8	44	2.6	12	2.0	907	3.7
Help child learn for school	371	1.9	5	0.8	29	2.2	26	1.5	4	0.7	436	1.8
Help child be independent	419	2.1	10	1.4	28	2.1	5	0.3	3	0.4	465	1.9
Help child get along with others	713	3.6	16	2.3	25	1.9	10	0.6	2	0.4	766	3.1
School (Respondent's)	338	1.7	53	7.8	32	2.4	69	4.0	11	1.7	503	2.1
Job training (Respondent's)	25	0.1	9	1.3	82	6.3	21	1.2	1	0.2	138	0.6
"To go out"	4,821	24.1	52	7.6	107	8.2	114	6.6	74	11.7	5,168	21.2
Other, no care used	7,900	39.4	264	38.4	562	43.2	528	30.7	375	59.2	9,629	39.5
Total	20,027	100.0	686	100.0	1,301	100.0	1,722	100.0	633	100.0	24,369	-
Percent of base	-	82.2	-	2.8	-	5.3	-	7.1	-	2.6	-	100.0

For this reason, subsequent tabulations in this report by marital status are given using this abbreviated variable in which "not married" denotes never married, separated, divorced and widowed.

The fact that unmarried respondents were about as likely to use some form of care as those who were married should not be construed to mean that they do not use more care. Indeed, the unmarried use more care and pay more for care. The principal difference is a much higher utilization of casual home-based arrangements among the married and more work-related care among the unmarried. Where respondents used some care to work and other care for one or more of the adult-convenience-type reasons, work was likely to be the most important reason (cf., Table 2-3, supra).

Furthermore, unmarried respondents tend to have less disposable income and are thus less likely to purchase care for convenience alone. With the exception of school or job training, upper income respondents tend to use more care for each and all of the reasons in our taxonomy (Table 2-7). As discussed at greater length in Volume II, upper income households, especially white households, are substantially more likely to use care in their own homes by non-relatives. Upper income households are not only more likely simply to use care, but they use more hours of care per capita as well.

Care for the child developmental reasons, thought by some to be a "luxury," is not limited exclusively to the upper income. Eight percent of those above 200% of poverty use care primarily for these reasons versus 5.2% of those above poverty but with incomes less than 200% of the poverty limits. In all likelihood, publicly-sponsored programs influence this distribution.

Differences by racial and ethnic groupings are also evident (Tables 2-8 and 2-9). Although these distributions are somewhat confounded by differing income levels and proportions of two-parent households among

TABLE 2-7

Most Important Reason for Using Care by Poverty Status

	Below Poverty		Within 200% of Poverty		Above 200% of Poverty		All Respondents	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
To work or seek work	461	14.4	1,192	22.6	3,364	25.6	5,017	23.2
Regular community activities	16	0.5	158	3.0	189	1.4	363	1.7
Occasional community activities	22	0.7	88	1.7	207	1.6	316	1.5
Get away from children sometimes	109	3.4	103	1.9	593	4.5	804	3.7
Help child learn for school	73	2.3	73	1.4	250	1.9	396	1.8
Help child be independent	35	1.1	90	1.7	288	2.2	413	1.9
Help child get along with others	58	1.8	149	2.8	509	3.9	716	3.3
School (Respondent's)	107	3.3	83	1.6	281	2.1	470	2.2
Job training (Respondent's)	86	2.7	32	0.6	17	0.1	135	0.6
"To go out"	420	13.1	1,037	19.6	3,251	24.8	4,709	21.8
Other, no care used	1,826	56.8	2,280	43.1	4,179	31.8	8,285	38.3
Total	3,212	100.0	5,285	100.0	13,127	100.0	21,624	-
Percent of base	-	14.9	-	24.4	-	60.7	-	100.0

the various racial groupings, it is nevertheless clear that whites use more casual, in-home babysitting than do minorities.

TABLE 2-8

Type of Reason Given
by Summary Ethnic Status

Type of Reason	White non-Spanish	Minority
Work/school related	23.1	32.7
Adult convenience	34.1	10.5
Child development	6.9	6.6
None/other	35.9	50.3
	100.0	100.0

Households with younger children are, of course, more likely to use care than households including only older children. Because the questionnaire elicited only the reasons for using main methods of care, the reasons for using care cannot be broken down by the ages of individual children receiving care. However, the age of the youngest children in households provides a good measure of the tendencies toward using care for varying reasons associated with children's ages (Table 2-10).

The incidence of child care for work-related reasons is relatively constant between the ages two and six. In Volume II, it was reported that two year olds are the most likely to use care largely because in the usual pre-school ages (0-5), a greater proportion of two year olds have employed mothers than any of the other individual years of age (Table 2-11).

TABLE 2-9

Most Important Reason for Using Care By Race/Ethnicity

Most Important Reason	White		Black		Spanish		Other, Unknown		All Respondents	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
To work or seek work	3,829	20.9	1,122	32.0	298	22.6	314	25.0	5,562	22.8
Regular community activities	400	2.2	17	0.5	9	0.6	0	0.0	425	1.7
Occasional community activities	362	2.0	12	0.3	3	0.3	0	0.0	378	1.5
Get away from children sometimes	851	4.6	33	0.9	17	1.3	15	1.2	916	3.8
Help child learn for school	275	1.5	108	3.1	22	1.6	31	2.5	436	1.8
Help child be independent	367	2.0	59	1.7	30	2.3	9	0.7	465	1.9
Help child get along with others	624	3.4	76	2.2	29	2.2	36	2.8	765	3.1
School (Respondent's)	358	2.0	114	3.2	25	1.9	7	0.6	503	2.1
Job training (Respondent's)	31	0.2	33	0.9	7	0.6	67	5.3	138	0.6
"To go out"	4,638	25.3	264	7.5	170	12.9	96	7.7	5,168	21.2
Other, no care used	6,579	35.9	1,668	47.6	707	53.7	681	54.2	9,635	39.5
Total	18,312	100.0	3,507	100.0	1,316	100.0	1,255	100.0	24,389	-
Percent of base	-	75.1	-	14.4	-	5.4	-	5.1	-	100.0

TABLE 2-10

Most Important Reason for Using Care by Age of Youngest Child

	0-2 Years		3-5 Years		6-9 Years		10-13 Years		All Respondents	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
To work or seek work	1,564	21.4	1,862	28.9	1,427	25.2	709	14.3	5,562	22.8
Regular community activities	111	1.5	116	1.8	127	2.2	71	1.4	425	1.7
Occasional community activities	99	1.4	167	2.6	54	1.0	58	1.2	378	1.5
Get away from children sometimes	468	6.4	261	4.0	145	2.6	43	0.9	916	3.8
Help child learn for school	148	2.0	251	3.9	29	0.5	7	0.1	436	1.8
Help child be independent	142	1.9	156	2.4	114	2.0	54	1.1	465	1.9
Help child get along with others	338	4.6	271	4.2	147	2.6	11	0.2	766	3.1
School (Respondent's)	144	2.0	203	3.1	82	1.4	75	1.5	503	2.1
Job training (Respondent's)	86	1.2	19	0.3	25	0.4	8	0.2	138	0.6
"To go out"	2,383	32.6	1,204	18.7	968	17.1	613	12.4	5,168	21.2
Other, no care used	1,836	25.1	1,941	30.1	2,546	45.0	3,312	66.8	9,635	39.5
Total	7,317	100.0	6,450	100.0	5,665	100.0	4,959	100.0	24,390	-
Percent of base	-	30.0	-	26.4	-	23.2	-	20.3	-	100.0

TABLE 2-11

Percent of Children Having Employed Mothers by Age

Age	Percent With Employed Mothers	Age	Percent With Employed Mothers
Under 1	17%	7	36%
1	23	8	33
2	33	9	34
3	28	10	39
4	29	11	42
5	30	12	39
6	34	13	38

Over 80% of households using care primarily for the child developmental reasons have children five years old or younger representing about 10% of households with children in this age range. Care used for the adult convenience reasons generally decreases as the youngest child enters the school system and becomes more capable of coping with less supervision and care.

The reasons why care is used is apparently very influential in selecting types of arrangements (Table 2-12). For example, about 44% of nursery school users gave as their most important reason one of the child developmental categories versus only 14% of day care center users and 9% of respondents using non-relatives operating in other homes. Some of the observed difference between nursery school and center users may be purely semantical. That is, two users of the same facility might hypothetically have reported

TABLE 2-12

Most Important Reason for Using Care By Main Method

Most Important Reason	Own Home Relative		Own Home Non-relative		Other Home Relative		Other Non-relative		Nursery School		Day Care Center		Other Methods		All Respondents	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
To work or seek work	1,031	30.2	718	22.6	1,319	31.9	1,480	58.9	319	36.5	380	69.1	117	20.8	5,364	35.3
Regular community activities	130	3.8	122	3.8	55	1.3	61	2.4	9	1.1	0	0.0	11	1.3	387	2.5
Occasional community activities	73	2.1	80	2.5	82	2.0	80	3.2	10	1.2	0	0.0	11	1.7	337	2.2
Get away from children sometimes	222	6.5	259	8.2	246	5.9	59	2.4	71	8.1	1	0.1	25	5.2	882	5.8
Help child learn for school	26	0.8	51	1.6	74	1.8	27	1.1	168	19.3	30	5.4	55	23.1	431	2.8
Help child be independent	117	3.4	87	2.7	120	2.9	54	2.1	40	4.6	9	1.6	22	2.9	449	3.0
Help child get along with others	84	2.5	102	3.2	151	3.6	120	4.8	177	20.2	40	7.3	79	10.9	752	5.0
School (Respondent's)	76	2.2	123	3.9	73	1.8	95	3.8	27	3.1	64	11.6	25	3.9	482	3.2
Job training (Respondent's)	91	2.7	0	0.0	26	0.6	0	0.0	4	0.5	11	2.0	3	0.3	135	0.9
"To go out"	1,387	40.6	1,447	45.5	1,612	39.0	403	16.0	36	4.2	11	2.0	135	25.0	5,031	33.1
Other, no care used	181	5.3	187	5.9	379	9.2	134	5.3	12	1.4	5	0.8	36	5.0	934	6.2
Total	3,418	100.0	3,176	100.0	4,136	100.0	2,513	100.0	874	100.0	550	100.0	518	100.0	15,185	-
Percent of base	-	22.5	-	20.9	-	27.2	-	16.5	-	5.8	-	3.6	-	3.4	-	100.0

nursery school and day care center, respectively, because they used care for different reasons despite exactly similar program attributes.

In any event, center usage is linked most strongly by far to work. Relatives and babysitters, on the other hand, tend to be associated most strongly with the adult convenience factors. Still, it must be underscored that more than 45% of all respondents using care in support of work, job training or school use care by relatives as their main method.

Disincentives, Guilts and Fears

It would be difficult to devise a sensible means to measure exactly why non-users do not use care, or what attitudes might impede other respondents from using more care. But in a series of unstructured group focus interviews leading to the development of the questionnaire several respondents volunteered feelings indicating that they held fears about how their children might be treated or influenced in certain child care arrangements or that they felt guilty about leaving their children with others.

Consequently, a set of attitudinal measures were included in the instrument to test the hypothesis that substantial proportions of mothers either felt guilty about using care or would worry excessively about the effects of care on their children. Some of these items, particularly those dealing with working mothers or particular types of care, are relegated to subsequent sections below. Six of the items, however, can be construed to apply to child care in general and are thus included at the end of this section. Among the observations to be made are:

Statement: "I sometimes feel guilty when I have to leave my child with someone else." (Tables 2-13 and 2-14)

Comments: Opinion was about equally divided on this assertion. Although married respondents (i.e., those who might be able to leave child with their spouses) were less likely to agree, there is apparently a base of about 12% who strongly agree distributed rather uniformly across races, income levels and users versus non-users. Differences by employment status and income level are largely controlled and confounded by marital status.

Statement: "I would worry about my child being treated badly while someone else is taking care of him/her." (Tables 2-15 and 2-16)

Comment: While most respondents disagreed, nearly a third expressed their agreement. Low-income minority respondents were especially likely to agree and strongly agree with the statement. On this item, as well as others below in which the word "worry" is used, it is difficult to distinguish between a normal, responsible concern for children's welfare and strong fears which might impede child care usage. Users of child care were only slightly more likely than non-users to agree with the statement.

Statement: "Children often pick up bad habits from those who care for them." (Tables 2-17 and 2-18)

Comment: That nearly 45% of respondents agreed that bad habits were often acquired from providers can be interpreted to indicate that parents are frequently apprehensive about the impact of providers on their children. Although the differences in the distributions between users and non-users can be considered to be small on the whole, it is significant that nursery school users were more likely to agree. Remember, however, that younger children are involved here and that parents frequently use nursery schools for the child developmental reasons. Increased awareness of the impacts of care on children's personalities, characters and personal habits may thus have something to do with this phenomenon.

Statement: "I am the only one who can really provide for my child's needs." (Tables 2-19 and 2-20)

Comment: About a third agreed. Interpretations were influenced, but not controlled by, respondents' marital status. That is, married parents were less likely to agree since spouses, rather than child care, could provide for children's needs. Non-users were the most likely to agree with the statement and users of the institutional forms of care (i.e., centers and nursery schools) were significantly less likely to agree. It is also probably correct to conclude that a kind of "maternal possessiveness" is more common among the poor and those not employed. These two variables (i.e., income and employment status) are, of course, highly interrelated.

Statement: "I would worry about my child becoming closer to the person who takes care of him/her if he/she spent more time with them (sic) than I am able to." (Tables 2-21 and 2-22)

Comment: Although about 4% strongly agreed, just over two-thirds of the available response disagreed. The distribution of those strongly agreeing is largely an artifact of differing tendencies toward polarity. That is, a residual group of respondents tending to be poor, not married and not employed can be seen throughout the attitude statements to give "strong" opinions. By contrast, day care users exhibit a central tendency (i.e., low polarity). With this in mind, the fear of "(my) child becoming closer to the (caregiver)" is not widespread although it may be a secondary or tertiary factor to some parents.

In discussing attitudes, there is great risk in dealing only with the negative. As we have seen by the distributions of reasons for using care, child development is a primary goal (and more often a secondary goal) of usage. As one measure of the public opinion on the possible benefits of care to children, the following attitude statement was included:

Statement: "Taking children out of their home (sic) to someone else is good for children since it makes them more independent." (Tables 2-23 and 2-24)

Comment: Majorities in all of the selected demographic groupings agreed with this statement. Non-users, however, were less likely to agree as were users of the in-home methods of care. But in no case did as many as one in three disagree. Non-users and in-home users, it may be pointed out, tend to have only older children in their households, and it may be true that older children's independence may be perceived as a problem as often as a desired goal. It can be noted, also, that our polar group "maternal possessives" can be found in the strongly disagree column.

TABLE 2-13

REACTION TO THE STATEMENT:
"I SOMETIMES FEEL GUILTY WHEN I HAVE TO LEAVE MY CHILD WITH SOMEONE ELSE."
(WEIGHTED PERCENTS BASED ON ALL HOUSEHOLDS)

	STRONGLY AGREE	AGREE	NEUTRAL (NEITHER)	DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE	NO OPINION	TOTAL WEIGHTED	RAW
BY CURRENT MARITAL STATUS:								
MARRIED	11.0	32.5	10.8	36.7	7.2	1.7	20027	3435
NOT MARRIED	16.5	37.3	10.7	27.7	5.9	1.9	4342	1171
BY RESPONDENTS EMPLOYMENT STATUS:								
EMPLOYED(FULL/PART)	13.4	36.3	11.0	31.5	6.1	1.7	8934	1761
NOT EMPLOYED	11.2	31.7	10.7	37.3	7.5	1.7	15375	2835
BY RACE/ETNICITY:								
WHITE	11.0	31.9	10.9	36.6	7.9	1.7	18312	2543
BLACK	15.3	37.0	9.7	30.9	5.6	1.6	3507	1408
SPANISH/OTHER	15.2	39.7	11.1	29.7	2.0	2.3	2571	657
BY POVERTY STATUS:								
BELOW POVERTY	18.8	36.3	10.0	28.9	4.4	1.6	3212	856
WITHIN 200% OF	11.8	34.7	10.9	34.9	6.4	1.3	5285	1189
ABOVE 200% OF POV.	10.2	32.3	10.9	37.7	7.8	1.0	13127	2036
ALL RESPONDENTS	12.0	33.4	10.8	35.3	7.0	1.6	24390	4609

UNCO

TABLE 2-14

REACTION TO THE STATEMENT:
"I SOMETIMES FEEL GUILTY WHEN I HAVE TO LEAVE MY CHILD WITH SOMEONE ELSE."
(WEIGHTED PERCENTS BY MAIN METHOD OF CARE)

	STRONGLY AGREE	AGREE	NEUTRAL (NEITHER)	DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE	NO OPINION	TOTAL WEIGHTED	TOTAL RAW
IN HOME/RELATIVE	12.8	33.8	11.9	33.3	6.9	1.2	3418	633
IN HOME/NON-RELATIVE	5.2	35.4	12.8	34.7	10.3	1.6	3176	450
IN RELATIVE'S HOME	11.9	35.0	9.1	36.8	6.1	1.1	4138	841
IN NON-RELATIVES HOME	13.7	33.0	10.1	36.5	5.9	0.8	2513	441
NURSERY SCHOOL	17.0	33.8	10.5	26.0	9.7	3.0	874	180
DAYCARE CENTER	13.0	47.1	9.2	20.1	6.1	4.6	550	120
BEFORE/AFTER SCHOOL	6.9	34.0	15.6	37.5	5.0	1.0	308	56
HEADSTART	45.1	31.5	0.0	16.9	6.5	0.0	71	22
OTHER METHOD	10.9	31.0	17.1	33.3	7.6	0.0	591	95
NO MAIN METHOD	13.2	31.2	10.2	36.7	6.3	2.4	8754	1771
ALL RESPONDENTS	12.0	33.5	10.8	35.1	6.9	1.7	24390	4609

UACC

TABLE 2-15

REACTION TO THE STATEMENT:
"I WOULD WORRY ABOUT MY CHILD BEING TREATED BADLY WHILE SOMEONE ELSE IS
TAKING CARE OF HIM/HER."
(WEIGHTED PERCENTS BASED ON ALL HOUSEHOLDS)

	STRONGLY AGREE	AGREE	NEUTRAL (NEITHER)	DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE	NO OPINION	TOTAL WEIGHTED	RAW
BY CURRENT MARITAL STATUS:								
MARRIED	5.6	22.0	15.6	48.9	6.1	1.8	20027	3435
NOT MARRIED	9.9	25.6	15.8	41.6	5.3	1.8	4342	1171
BY RESPONDENTS EMPLOYMENT STATUS:								
EMPLOYED(FULL/PART)	4.7	19.9	16.4	49.7	7.4	1.8	8934	1761
NOT EMPLOYED	7.3	24.2	15.3	46.3	5.1	1.7	15375	2835
BY RACE/ETNICITY:								
WHITE	4.5	21.2	16.6	50.1	5.9	1.8	18312	2543
BLACK	9.7	25.8	13.4	43.5	5.9	1.7	3507	1408
SPANISH/OTHER	14.7	29.2	12.0	35.1	6.8	2.2	2571	658
BY POVERTY STATUS:								
BELOW POVERTY	14.8	25.3	15.5	39.7	3.6	1.1	3212	856
WITHIN 200% OF	6.4	23.7	16.7	46.7	4.6	1.9	5285	1189
ABOVE 200% OF POV.	4.2	20.8	15.6	51.1	7.1	1.1	13127	2036
ALL RESPONDENTS	6.4	22.5	15.7	47.7	6.0	1.7	24390	4609

UNCO

TABLE 2-16

REACTION TO THE STATEMENT:
"I WOULD WORRY ABOUT MY CHILD BEING TREATED BADLY WHILE SOMEONE ELSE IS TAKING CARE OF HIM/HER."
(WEIGHTED PERCENTS BY MAIN METHOD OF CARE)

	STRONGLY AGREE	AGREE	NEUTRAL (NEITHER)	DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE	NO OPINION	TOTAL WEIGHTED	TOTAL RAW
IN HOME/RELATIVE	9.3	23.1	14.7	46.9	4.7	1.3	3418	633
IN HOME/NON-RELATIVE	4.5	19.6	19.6	48.6	5.6	2.0	3176	450
IN RELATIVE'S HOME	5.3	22.2	17.0	47.2	6.9	1.4	4136	841
IN NON-RELATIVES HOME	4.2	17.2	17.3	51.1	9.0	1.2	2513	441
NURSERY SCHOOL	2.7	13.5	11.9	55.1	13.8	3.0	874	180
DAYCARE CENTER	0.6	27.6	15.6	43.9	7.0	5.3	550	120
BEFORE/AFTER SCHOOL	1.9	24.6	11.1	59.2	3.3	0.0	308	56
HEADSTART	12.4	17.8	14.3	53.7	1.8	0.0	71	22
OTHER METHOD	6.3	28.1	14.0	46.9	3.7	1.0	591	95
NO MAIN METHOD	7.8	25.7	14.1	45.6	4.8	2.0	8754	1771
ALL RESPONDENTS	6.4	22.7	15.6	47.5	6.0	1.8	24390	4609

UNCO

TABLE 2-17

REACTION TO THE STATEMENT: "CHILDREN OFTEN PICK UP BAD HABITS FROM THOSE WHO CARE FOR THEM." (WEIGHTED PERCENTS BASED ON ALL HOUSEHOLDS)

	STRONGLY AGREE	AGREE	NEUTRAL (NEITHER)	DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE	NO OPINION	TOTAL WEIGHTED	RAW
BY CURRENT MARITAL STATUS:								
MARRIED	7.8	36.4	26.6	24.9	1.8	2.5	20027	3435
NOT MARRIED	9.2	37.5	25.8	22.6	2.7	2.3	4342	1171
BY RESPONDENTS EMPLOYMENT STATUS:								
EMPLOYED(FULL/PART)	6.8	35.8	27.0	25.8	2.6	1.9	8934	1761
NOT EMPLOYED	8.8	37.2	26.1	23.6	1.6	2.7	15375	2835
BY RACE/ETNICITY:								
WHITE	8.1	37.0	27.2	23.7	1.6	2.5	18312	2543
BLACK	8.4	36.4	23.7	25.6	3.9	2.0	3507	1408
SPANISH/OTHER	7.3	34.6	24.5	28.7	1.8	3.0	2571	657
BY POVERTY STATUS:								
BELOW POVERTY	9.4	36.4	22.5	26.2	2.3	3.2	3212	856
WITHIN 200% OF	8.8	37.0	25.6	24.6	1.6	2.4	5285	1189
ABOVE 200% OF POV.	7.3	36.4	28.6	24.7	1.6	1.4	13127	2036
A L L RESPONDENTS	8.0	36.6	26.5	24.6	1.9	2.3	24390	4609

UNCO

TABLE 2-18

REACTION TO THE STATEMENT:
"CHILDREN OFTEN PICK UP BAD HABITS FROM THOSE WHO CARE FOR THEM."
(WEIGHTED PERCENTS BY MAIN METHOD OF CARE)

	STRONGLY AGREE	AGREE	NEUTRAL (NEITHER)	DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE	NO OPINION	TOTAL WEIGHTED	RAW
IN HOME/RELATIVE	6.5	37.1	27.9	23.5	2.7	2.3	3418	633
IN HOME/NON-RELATIVE	7.0	36.5	27.9	25.0	1.7	1.9	3176	450
IN RELATIVE'S HOME	7.9	35.9	26.9	25.9	1.7	1.7	4136	841
IN NON-RELATIVES HOME	5.0	35.0	30.7	24.8	3.3	1.3	2513	441
NURSERY SCHOOL	12.4	33.5	25.4	24.6	1.3	3.0	874	180
DAYCARE CENTER	3.3	30.9	26.6	35.4	1.7	2.1	550	120
BEFORE/AFTER SCHOOL	9.4	31.9	32.6	26.2	0.0	0.0	308	56
HEADSTART	19.9	47.7	8.8	18.9	4.7	0.0	71	22
OTHER METHOD	9.6	40.7	27.4	21.2	0.0	1.1	591	95
NO MAIN METHOD	9.7	37.8	23.7	23.4	1.7	3.6	8754	1771
ALL RESPONDENTS	8.1	36.6	26.4	24.5	2.0	2.5	24390	4609

UACD

TABLE 2-19

REACTION TO THE STATEMENT:
"I AM THE ONLY ONE WHO CAN REALLY PROVIDE FOR MY CHILD'S NEEDS."
(WEIGHTED PERCENTS BASED ON ALL HOUSEHOLDS)

	STRONGLY AGREE	AGREE	NEUTRAL (NEITHER)	DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE	NO OPINION	TOTAL	
							WEIGHTED	RAW
BY CURRENT MARITAL STATUS:								
MARRIED	12.0	16.7	14.6	48.5	6.4	1.7	20027	3435
NOT MARRIED	18.6	21.0	16.5	37.0	4.9	2.0	4342	1171
BY RESPONDENTS EMPLOYMENT STATUS:								
EMPLOYED(FULL/PART)	8.8	11.7	14.6	54.1	9.2	1.7	8934	1761
NOT EMPLOYED	15.8	20.9	15.1	42.1	4.3	1.8	15375	2835
BY RACE/ETNICITY:								
WHITE	11.7	15.6	15.7	48.5	6.6	1.9	18312	2543
BLACK	15.2	21.2	12.3	44.2	5.5	1.7	3507	1408
SPANISH/OTHER	21.2	26.2	12.7	34.9	3.5	1.5	2571	657
BY POVERTY STATUS:								
BELOW POVERTY	23.7	27.6	12.0	32.2	3.1	1.4	3212	856
WITHIN 200% OF	14.2	21.0	16.7	41.5	5.3	1.3	5285	1189
ABOVE 200% OF POV.	9.8	13.4	15.1	53.2	7.3	1.1	13127	2036
ALL RESPONDENTS	13.2	17.5	15.0	46.6	6.1	1.6	24390	4609

UNCO

TABLE 2-20

REACTION TO THE STATEMENT:
"I AM THE ONLY ONE WHO CAN REALLY PROVIDE FOR MY CHILD'S NEEDS."
(WEIGHTED PERCENTS BY MAIN METHOD OF CARE)

	STRONGLY AGREE	AGREE	NEUTRAL (NEITHER)	DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE	NO OPINION	TOTAL WEIGHTED	RAW
IN HOME/RELATIVE	14.6	14.4	17.4	47.9	4.0	1.7	3418	633
IN HOME/NON-RELATIVE	7.8	17.1	17.2	49.4	7.0	1.6	3176	450
IN RELATIVE'S HOME	10.5	17.7	17.1	46.7	6.7	1.3	4136	841
IN NON-RELATIVES HOME	10.1	10.3	13.8	54.9	9.4	1.5	2513	441
NURSERY SCHOOL	5.7	10.9	11.7	57.8	10.9	3.0	874	180
DAYCARE CENTER	5.1	15.9	11.5	48.5	14.4	4.6	550	120
BEFORE/AFTER SCHOOL	15.7	11.3	17.9	51.5	3.6	0.0	308	56
HEADSTART	35.2	5.9	10.5	43.8	4.7	0.0	71	22
OTHER METHOD	13.9	11.2	18.2	47.0	9.8	0.0	551	55
NO MAIN METHOD	17.8	22.3	12.7	40.8	4.3	2.1	8754	1771
ALL RESPONDENTS	13.2	17.5	14.9	46.4	6.1	1.8	24350	4609

UNCC

TABLE 2-21

REACTION TO THE STATEMENT:
"I WOULD WORRY ABOUT MY CHILD BECOMING CLOSER TO THE PERSON
WHO TAKES CARE OF HIM/HER IF HE/SHE SPENT MORE TIME WITH THEM
THAN I AM ABLE TO."
(WEIGHTED PERCENTS BASED ON ALL HOUSEHOLDS)

	STRONGLY AGREE	AGREE	NEUTRAL (NEITHER)	DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE	NO OPINION	TOTAL WEIGHTED	RAW
BY CURRENT MARITAL STATUS:								
MARRIED	3.8	15.4	11.1	56.3	11.6	1.8	20027	3435
NOT MARRIED	4.9	16.7	15.7	46.9	13.6	2.2	4342	1171
BY RESPONDENTS EMPLOYMENT STATUS:								
EMPLOYED(FULL/PART)	2.6	12.3	9.6	57.9	15.8	1.8	8934	1761
NOT EMPLOYED	4.8	17.7	13.2	52.8	9.6	1.9	15375	2835
BY RACE/ETNICITY:								
WHITE	3.6	14.6	11.3	56.2	12.6	1.8	18312	2543
BLACK	6.1	19.6	12.4	50.1	10.2	1.6	3507	1408
SPANISH/OTHER	4.3	17.6	15.7	49.9	9.7	2.9	2571	657
BY POVERTY STATUS:								
BELOW POVERTY	7.4	17.9	16.3	46.8	10.0	1.5	3212	856
WITHIN 200% OF	3.9	17.9	13.2	53.3	9.8	1.9	5285	1189
ABOVE 200% OF POV.	3.3	13.7	10.3	57.9	13.7	1.1	13127	2036
ALL RESPONDENTS	4.0	15.6	11.9	54.8	12.0	1.8	24390	4609

UNCO

TABLE 2-22

REACTION TO THE STATEMENT:
"I WOULD WORRY ABOUT MY CHILD BECOMING CLOSER TO THE PERSON
WHO TAKES CARE OF HIM/HER IF HE/SHE SPENT MORE TIME WITH THEM
THAN I AM ABLE TO."
(WEIGHTED PERCENTS BY MAIN METHOD OF CARE)

	STRONGLY AGREE	AGREE	NEUTRAL (NEITHER)	DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE	NO OPINION	TOTAL WEIGHTED	TOTAL RAW
IN HOME/RELATIVE	5.2	12.8	17.4	51.8	11.3	1.6	3418	633
IN HOME/NON-RELATIVE	2.1	13.7	10.5	58.7	13.5	1.6	3176	450
IN RELATIVE'S HOME	4.9	17.3	11.4	54.6	10.3	1.4	4136	841
IN NON-RELATIVES HOME	1.6	12.9	10.8	55.1	18.3	1.3	2513	441
NURSERY SCHOOL	2.2	8.7	7.1	58.3	20.7	3.0	874	180
DAYCARE CENTER	1.1	17.5	5.6	50.0	21.3	4.6	550	120
BEFORE/AFTER SCHOOL	0.8	11.2	4.3	65.2	18.4	0.0	308	56
HEADSTART	16.8	8.9	5.1	60.7	8.5	0.0	71	22
OTHER METHOD	5.9	24.5	8.7	51.1	9.7	0.0	551	95
NO MAIN METHOD	4.7	17.7	12.2	53.9	9.0	2.4	8754	1771
ALL RESPONDENTS	4.0	15.7	11.9	54.7	11.9	1.9	24350	4609

UACC

TABLE 2-23

REACTION TO THE STATEMENT:
"TAKING CHILDREN OUT OF THEIR HOME TO SOMEONE ELSE IS GOOD FOR CHILDREN,
SINCE IT MAKES THEM MORE INDEPENDENT."
(WEIGHTED PERCENTS BASED ON ALL HOUSEHOLDS)

	STRONGLY AGREE	AGREE	NEUTRAL (NEITHER)	DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE	NO OPINION	TOTAL WEIGHTED	RAW
BY CURRENT MARITAL STATUS:								
MARRIED	8.8	42.2	25.4	18.5	2.9	2.2	20027	3435
NOT MARRIED	11.5	40.6	23.8	18.9	3.2	2.0	4342	1171
BY RESPONDENTS EMPLOYMENT STATUS:								
EMPLOYED(FULL/PART)	9.4	43.8	26.7	16.9	1.4	1.8	8934	1761
NOT EMPLOYED	9.2	40.9	24.3	19.6	3.8	2.3	15375	2835
BY RACE/ETNICITY:								
WHITE	8.8	42.1	26.7	18.1	2.4	1.9	18312	2543
BLACK	11.7	41.8	21.5	20.1	2.8	2.1	3507	1408
SPANISH/OTHER	9.3	40.8	19.3	20.1	6.6	3.8	2571	657
BY POVERTY STATUS:								
BELOW POVERTY	12.2	39.4	19.4	22.4	4.1	2.5	3212	856
WITHIN 200% OF	9.8	44.1	23.5	18.2	2.4	2.0	5285	1189
ABOVE 200% OF POV.	8.7	41.9	28.4	17.1	2.8	1.1	13127	2036
ALL RESPONDENTS	9.3	42.0	25.3	18.5	2.9	2.0	24390	4609

UNCO

TABLE 2-24

REACTION TO THE STATEMENT:
"TAKING CHILDREN OUT OF THEIR HOME TO SOMEONE ELSE IS GOOD FOR CHILDREN,
SINCE IT MAKES THEM MORE INDEPENDENT."
(WEIGHTED PERCENTS BY MAIN METHOD OF CARE)

	STRONGLY AGREE	AGREE	NEUTRAL (NEITHER)	DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE	NO OPINION	TOTAL WEIGHTED	RAW
IN HOME/RELATIVE	7.8	40.7	29.4	15.8	4.6	1.7	3418	633
IN HOME/NON-RELATIVE	6.7	35.8	30.0	22.6	3.2	1.6	3176	450
IN RELATIVE'S HOME	8.9	50.8	24.0	13.5	1.7	1.2	4136	841
IN NON-RELATIVES HOME	14.3	46.5	23.6	11.9	2.1	1.6	2513	441
NURSERY SCHOOL	17.7	47.0	24.1	4.8	3.4	3.0	874	180
DAYCARE CENTER	14.2	47.1	21.9	14.2	0.5	2.1	550	120
BEFORE/AFTER SCHOOL	7.0	39.7	27.2	22.3	1.6	2.2	308	56
HEADSTART	30.6	25.0	18.4	17.1	3.1	5.8	71	22
OTHER METHOD	12.2	41.2	32.4	14.1	0.0	0.0	591	95
NO MAIN METHOD	8.1	38.5	22.5	24.4	3.4	3.1	8754	1771
ALL RESPONDENTS	9.3	41.9	25.1	18.6	2.9	2.1	24390	4609

UNCO

III. Satisfaction and Preferences

Section III

SATISFACTION AND PREFERENCES

Satisfaction in General

Respondents were asked to agree or disagree with the statement "I am happy with the person or place who takes care of my child" (Tables 3-1 and 3-2). To the extent that the responses to this question may be interpreted to reflect convergence of both satisfactory types of care as well as suitable individual providers, a solid nine of ten users were satisfied or at least "happy" with their then current arrangement. Only about 2% of users were clearly "not happy" with their providers.

Most of the "neutral" response (i.e., neither agree nor disagree) can be attributed to "non-users" (i.e., "no main method"). The fact that most non-users expressed an opinion does not suggest an anomaly. Some respondents may have been commenting that they were happy they did not use child care or that they were unhappy that they couldn't locate or afford a suitable provider. Most "non-users," however, used forms of intramural care (e.g., by spouse, or by sibling) and were probably referring to these arrangements.

Respondents who were not married were somewhat less satisfied. This difference is statistically significant but it is not very strong. Less than half a percent of mothers with children under 14 strongly disagreed with the statement.

TABLE 3-1

REACTION TO THE STATEMENT:
"I AM HAPPY WITH THE PERSON OR PLACE WHO TAKES CARE OF MY CHILD."
(WEIGHTED PERCENTS BASED ON ALL HOUSEHOLDS)

	STRONGLY AGREE	AGREE	NEUTRAL (NEITHER)	DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE	NO OPINION	TOTAL WEIGHTED	RAW
BY CURRENT MARITAL STATUS:								
MARRIED	43.0	43.5	9.3	1.3	0.3	2.6	20027	3435
NOT MARRIED	39.5	43.8	11.4	2.5	0.7	2.1	4342	1171
BY RESPONDENTS EMPLOYMENT STATUS:								
EMPLOYED(FULL/PART)	42.9	44.2	8.3	1.9	0.5	2.3	8934	1761
NOT EMPLOYED	42.0	43.4	10.4	1.3	0.3	2.5	15375	2835
BY RACE/ETNICITY:								
WHITE	43.1	44.1	8.6	1.4	0.4	2.4	18312	2543
BLACK	43.5	41.5	10.7	1.6	0.4	2.5	3507	1408
SPANISH/OTHER	35.0	42.7	16.4	2.4	0.4	3.2	2571	657
BY POVERTY STATUS:								
BELOW POVERTY	43.2	41.9	11.5	1.4	0.3	1.7	3212	856
WITHIN 200% OF	41.5	44.8	9.1	1.9	0.3	2.4	5285	1189
ABOVE 200% OF POV.	43.7	43.9	8.9	1.4	0.4	1.6	13127	2036
ALL RESPONDENTS	42.5	43.7	9.6	1.5	0.4	2.3	24390	4609

UNCO

TABLE 3-2

REACTION TO THE STATEMENT:
"I AM HAPPY WITH THE PERSON OR PLACE WHO TAKES CARE OF MY CHILD."
(WEIGHTED PERCENTS BY MAIN METHOD OF CARE)

	STRONGLY AGREE	AGREE	NEUTRAL (NEITHER)	DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE	NO OPINION	TOTAL WEIGHTED	TOTAL RAW
IN HOME/RELATIVE	51.1	42.6	3.1	1.4	0.6	1.3	3418	633
IN HOME/NON-RELATIVE	38.8	51.2	6.3	1.4	0.3	2.0	3176	450
IN RELATIVE'S HOME	50.4	42.9	3.2	1.6	0.4	1.4	4136	841
IN NON-RELATIVES HOME	48.2	43.3	4.8	2.1	0.5	1.1	2513	441
NURSERY SCHOOL	47.8	40.9	5.5	2.8	0.0	3.0	874	180
DAYCARE CENTER	43.3	48.4	2.6	3.5	0.0	2.1	550	120
BEFORE/AFTER SCHOOL	22.3	56.3	14.4	1.9	0.0	5.1	308	56
HEADSTART	37.7	53.1	9.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	71	22
OTHER METHOD	50.7	40.8	4.1	4.4	0.0	0.0	591	95
NO MAIN METHOD	34.3	41.3	19.1	0.9	0.4	4.0	8754	1771
ALL RESPONDENTS	42.3	43.6	9.7	1.5	0.4	2.5	24390	4609

UACC

In a separate series of questions, respondents were asked for each child using a given method of care to rate their satisfaction according to the categories "very satisfied," "satisfied," "not completely satisfied" or "dissatisfied." While the results of this question confirm that most users are indeed satisfied, there is a small but clear proportion using each method of care who are less than satisfied (Table 3-3).

TABLE 3-3

Summary Levels of "Less Than Satisfied" Consumers
(Based on number of children using method)

Type of Care	Approximate Number of Children Using (Thousands)	Percent Whose Parents are Not Completely Satisfied or are Dissatisfied
In own home:		
By relative	11,470	3.6
By non-relative	11,107	8.4
In other home:		
By relative	13,706	3.9
By non-relative	8,345	6.5
Nursery school	1,981	6.3
Day care center	960	8.5
Cooperative program	546	7.5
Before/after school program	1,676	5.3
Headstart	130	10.5

Care by relatives, whether in the children's homes or the relatives' homes, is most nearly universally satisfactory. Only about 3.8% (3.6% of in-home and 3.9% of relatives' home) reported being less than satisfied.

Employed mothers account for most dissatisfaction (Tables 3-4 through 3-9). Interestingly, married respondents were less satisfied with day care center care despite the fact that the unmarried were generally more critical overall.

Perhaps the single most important bastion of discontent is comprised of households with marginal incomes (i.e., above poverty but within 200% of the poverty level) who use day care centers (Table 3-9). The reader will recall from Section II that these respondents were the least likely to use center care. Here we see that when they do use centers, they are the least likely to express complete satisfaction.

Preferences in General

The fact that only about 10% are less than satisfied with their current arrangement should not be construed to mean that 90% would not prefer some other method of care. When users were asked the question, "assuming (you) could have any type of child care you wanted, would (you) prefer to use some other type instead of (your current main method)?", 24% responded in the affirmative (Table 3-10). Hence, using weighted projections some 3.7 million households would prefer some other type of care, although our caveat merits restatement that some of these households are only very casual users.

Of those preferring to change, nearly 6% would choose either intra-household care (e.g., by spouse or sibling) or a public or private school arrangement at the kindergarten level or above (Table 3-11). The remainder would choose, in rank order of frequency, nursery schools (24%), day care centers (21%), in-home babysitting by non-relatives (16%), in-home care by relatives (14%), cooperative programs (8%), care in relatives' homes (6%),

TABLE 3-4

Parents' Ratings of Satisfaction With Care In-Home by Relatives (Percent Distributions of Children Receiving Care by Parents' Characteristics)

	Very Satisfied	Not Completely Satisfied	Satisfied	Dissatisfied	Total
By marital status:					
Married	83.7	13.3	2.6	0.4	100.0
Not married	72.1	21.2	5.9	0.8	100.0
By employment status:					
Employed	73.8	19.4	5.6	1.2	100.0
Not employed	84.7	12.9	2.2	0.2	100.0
By race/ethnicity:					
White	82.3	14.0	3.2	0.4	100.0
Black	78.7	16.7	4.2	0.4	100.0
Spanish/other	81.1	17.0	1.2	0.7	100.0
By income level:					
Below poverty	80.4	16.2	3.4	0.0	100.0
Above poverty but within 200%	81.9	15.8	2.3	0.1	100.0
Above 200% of poverty	83.6	12.3	3.3	0.9	100.0
All responses	81.8	14.6	3.1	0.5	100.0

TABLE 3-5

Parents' Ratings of Satisfaction With Care In-Home by Non-relatives (Percent Distributions of Children Receiving Care by Parents' Characteristics)

	Very Satisfied	Not Completely Satisfied	Satisfied	Dissatisfied	Total
By marital status:					
Married	65.8	26.1	7.2	0.8	100.0
Not married	47.1	41.4	7.9	3.6	100.0
By employment status:					
Employed	57.9	29.2	11.4	1.5	100.0
Not employed	66.9	26.8	5.4	1.0	100.0
By race/ethnicity:					
White	64.2	27.8	7.3	0.7	100.0
Black	63.4	31.8	1.1	3.8	100.0
Spanish/other	54.7	24.3	12.3	8.7	100.0
By income level:					
Below poverty	39.7	54.0	3.7	2.6	100.0
Above poverty but within 200%	61.2	32.7	5.7	0.4	100.0
Above 200% of poverty	64.7	25.4	8.7	1.2	100.0
All responses	63.8	27.8	7.3	1.1	100.0

TABLE 3-6

Parents' Ratings of Satisfaction With Care In Relatives' Homes (Percent Distributions of Children Receiving Care by Parents' Characteristics)

	Very Satisfied	Not Completely Satisfied	Satisfied	Dissatisfied	Total
By marital status:					
Married	79.4	17.4	2.3	1.0	100.0
Not married	71.0	21.5	3.8	3.7	100.0
By employment status:					
Employed	72.5	21.7	3.6	2.2	100.0
Not employed	80.5	16.4	2.0	1.0	100.0
By race/ethnicity:					
White	79.3	17.8	2.0	0.9	100.0
Black	77.0	16.8	3.9	2.2	100.0
Spanish/other	67.7	21.7	5.8	4.8	100.0
By income level:					
Below poverty	75.5	19.2	4.1	1.2	100.0
Above poverty but within 200%	78.3	18.7	1.7	1.3	100.0
Above 200% of poverty	78.7	17.2	2.9	1.2	100.0
All responses	78.2	18.0	2.5	1.4	100.0

TABLE 3-7

Parents' Ratings of Satisfaction With Care In Non-relatives' Homes (Percent Distributions of Children Receiving Care by Parents' Characteristics)

	Very Satisfied	Not Completely Satisfied	Satisfied	Dissatisfied	Total
By marital status:					
Married	73.7	20.3	4.6	1.3	100.0
Not married	62.7	27.8	4.8	4.6	100.0
By employment status:					
Employed	70.5	20.9	6.3	2.3	100.0
Not employed	73.4	21.9	3.3	1.4	100.0
By race/ethnicity:					
White	72.0	22.0	4.2	1.7	100.0
Black	73.6	18.9	5.2	2.2	100.0
Spanish/other	70.3	17.4	9.5	2.9	100.0
By income level:					
Below poverty	73.8	23.8	1.4	1.0	100.0
Above poverty but within 200%	69.4	19.6	8.0	3.0	100.0
Above 200% of poverty	72.4	21.2	4.6	1.9	100.0
All responses	72.1	21.5	4.7	1.8	100.0

TABLE 3-8

Parents' Ratings of Satisfaction With Care In Nursery Schools
(Percent Distributions of Children Receiving Care by Parents' Characteristics)

	Very Satisfied	Not Completely Satisfied	Satisfied	Dissatisfied	Total
By marital status:					
Married	75.2	17.5	6.7	0.5	100.0
Not married	69.6	28.7	1.3	0.4	100.0
By employment status:					
Employed	70.8	20.8	7.3	1.1	100.0
Not employed	76.8	18.3	4.8	0.1	100.0
By race/ethnicity:					
White	73.9	20.0	5.9	0.3	100.0
Black	71.2	18.6	9.7	0.5	100.0
Spanish/other	82.3	15.1	0.0	2.5	100.0
By income level:					
Below poverty	78.4	15.6	6.0	0.0	100.0
Above poverty but within 200%	64.1	33.8	1.5	0.6	100.0
Above 200% of poverty	72.9	19.1	7.3	0.7	100.0
All responses	74.3	19.4	5.8	0.5	100.0

TABLE 3-9

Parents' Ratings of Satisfaction With Care In Day Care Centers (Percent Distributions of Children Receiving Care by Parents' Characteristics)

	Very Satisfied	Not Completely Satisfied	Satisfied	Dissatisfied	Total
By marital status:					
Married	73.7	14.9	6.7	4.6	100.0
Not married	75.7	20.6	3.7	0.0	100.0
By employment status:					
Employed	73.9	17.4	5.9	2.8	100.0
Not employed	75.6	16.2	5.0	3.1	100.0
By race/ethnicity:					
White	72.0	16.3	7.4	4.4	100.0
Black	65.4	27.8	5.2	1.6	100.0
Spanish/other	90.4	8.5	1.2	0.0	100.0
By income level:					
Below poverty	77.1	17.4	1.8	3.7	100.0
Above poverty but within 200%	68.6	19.0	12.4	0.0	100.0
Above 200% of poverty	75.1	15.0	6.2	3.7	100.0
All responses	74.5	17.0	5.6	2.9	100.0

TABLE 3-10

Percent of Main Method Users Preferring to Change

Current Main Method	Prefer to Change? Yes	No	Total
Own home by relative	18.8	81.2	100.0
Own home by non-relative	24.5	75.5	100.0
Other home by relative	26.9	73.1	100.0
Other home by non-relative	32.2	67.8	100.0
Nursery or pre-school	16.0	84.0	100.0
Day care center	19.5	80.5	100.0
Cooperative program	18.8	81.2	100.0
Before/after school program	16.7	83.3	100.0
Headstart	9.0	91.0	100.0
All methods	23.8	76.2	100.0

before and after school program (6%) and family day care homes (3%), with about 4% distributed across other methods.

Users of arrangements in other homes, whether by relatives or non-relatives, are the most likely to prefer some other method (27% and 32%, respectively). Respondents using non-related babysitters in children's own homes run a close third at 25%.

In examining the distribution of preferred methods (Table 3-11), two clear groupings are evident. About 30% chose forms of in-home care, and

TABLE 3-11

Users Indicating Preferences for Other Methods of Care By Current Main Method

Preferred Method	In Own Home		In Other Home		Nursery School	Day Care Center	Other Methods	All Current Methods	
	Relative	Non-relative	Relative	Non-relative					
In own home:									
By relative	0	272	117	105	20	17	4	535	14.0%
	0.0	20.0	50.9	21.8	3.7	3.3	0.8	100.0	
By non-relative	106	0	209	188	38	42	17	601	15.8
	17.9	0.0	34.8	31.3	6.4	7.1	2.9	100.0	
In other home:									
By relative	49	79	0	75	5	0	17	226	5.9
	21.8	35.0	0.0	33.2	2.3	0.0	7.7	100.0	
By non-relative	36	6	47	0	10	24	0	124	3.2
	29.5	4.8	38.2	0.0	7.8	19.8	0.0	100.0	
Nursery school	234	108	387	182	0	6	4	920	24.2
	25.5	11.7	42.0	19.7	0.0	0.6	0.4	100.0	
Day care center	144	138	310	150	25	0	33	802	21.0
	18.0	17.3	38.7	18.8	3.2	0.0	4.1	100.0	
Other methods	143	119	122	207	12	0	0	603	15.9
	23.6	19.8	20.2	34.3	2.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	
Total:									
Number	713	723	1,192	906	111	90	76	3,811	100.0
Percent	18.7	19.0	31.3	23.8	2.9	2.4	2.0	100.0	

45% preferred institutional settings—either nursery schools or day care centers. Only 3% indicated a preference for Family Day Care Homes.

Attitudes on In-Home Care

Among the attitude statements in the questionnaire was:

Statement: "I would prefer to have someone come into my home to take care of my children over any other type of arrangement." (Tables 3-12 and 3-13)*

As a summative measure of preference, the overall distribution of responses to this item has powerful import. Fewer than one in three disagreed while a majority agreed. Fully a quarter strongly disagreed. Predictably, the strongest patterns of agreement are to be found among current users of in-home care.

On the other hand, only about 16% of nursery school and day care center users agreed, indicating that most users of institutional type care clearly prefer an out-of-home arrangement. Moreover, employed respondents were less likely to agree, although nearly 45% agreed with 20% strongly agreeing.

From these data it is safe to infer that there is a strong residual sentiment in favor of in-home care, even among the employed. Yet it is equally important to note that users of the more formal types of care (i.e., Family Day Care Homes, centers and nursery schools) are not merely forced into using these arrangements over in-home care because of cost or circumstance. The public preference for casual care remains linked to the home.

---

*Detailed tabulations on attitude statements appear at the end of the section to avoid encumbering the text.

To gauge the opinions and attitudes of various attributes and problems associated with in-home care, the following statements were presented to respondents for their reactions:

Statement: "I wouldn't have sitters come into my home to take care of my children unless I knew them very well." (Tables 3-14 and 3-15)

Comment: There is danger in over-interpreting the results of a question in which one or more of the answers can be construed to represent opposition to the safety or wellbeing of children. With this in mind, it borders on the bizarre that anyone at all strongly disagreed with this statement. That nearly 85% agreed with the statement (41% strongly agreeing) does at least mean that mothers nearly universally consider personal knowledge of the character habits and background of sitters to be a strong prerequisite to their employment.

Statement: "The people who have come into my home to take care of my children have always treated my home with respect." (Tables 3-16 and 3-17)

Comment: The fact that only about 5% disagreed with the statement indicates that most babysitters observe a satisfactory decorum. Yet the 7% of respondents using in-home care by non-relatives who disagreed can be interpreted to represent a substantial albeit infrequent problem.

Statement: "I have had to change my sitters often because they have been so undependable." (Tables 3-18 and 3-19)

Comment: On the basis of annecdotal conversations with parents, one might conclude that "undependability" constitutes a widespread problem with sitters. But the data suggest that although such problems do exist, less than 10% of households with children under 14 report either frequent or, by editorial inference, serious problems. It should be pointed out, however, that the question embraced only the notion of undependability, not such related potential problems as poor availability of sitters when needed or high turnover due to changes in babysitters' vocations or similar circumstances.

Statement: "If I had someone come into my home to stay with my children, I would worry about things disappearing." (Tables 3-20 and 3-21)

Comment: Although a clear majority disagreed with the statement, the proportion who agreed (18%) must be considered to be substantial. The fear of theft was observed to be particularly high among low-income respondents (30%) and racial minorities and constitutes a serious aspect of the composite attitude on in-home care.

Statement: "The trouble with having a person come into my home to take care of my children is that they soon get to know too much about me." (Tables 3-22 and 3-23)

Comment: Judging from the fact that respondents using unrelated providers were less likely to agree than were those using relatives, it is probable that many of the 13% who agreed were thinking of relatives. Unmarried, poor and minority respondents were the most likely to agree.

Statement: "A person who cares for my child(ren) should help around the house as well." (Tables 3-24 and 3-25)

Comment: If it was common practice for sitters to perform light housework, the concept is probably dying. Only about 18% agreed with this statement and strong patterns in the response distribution are neither evident by demographic categories nor usage status.

Notwithstanding the advantages or disadvantages of in-home care for those using full-time care, in-home care is probably the least controversial type of arrangement. It should not be presumed, however, that in-home care is optimal for all those indicating that they would prefer in-home care over any other arrangement. When unrelated providers are used, for example, costs are comparatively high.* Furthermore, some of the stated preferences may represent mere wishful thinking rather than potentially viable alternatives. Consider, for example, a mother who prefers in-home care by relatives but does not have any relatives nearby. There is not very much that can be done to satisfy this "preference."

Whatever explanations of the data are attempted, it is nevertheless clear that opinions to the effect that in-home care is the most desirable are very prevalent.

Attitudes on Relatives as Caregivers

Care by relatives can also be considered highly desirable to most parents. In response to the statement "my first choice for someone to take care of my children is a relative," 63% agreed (Tables 3-26 and 3-27). Fully one quarter strongly agreed.

The poor and those not employed were particularly likely to agree. There was even substantial agreement by day care center and nursery school users. Although pluralities disagreed with the statement, about one in three either agreed or strongly agreed. It is difficult to determine, however, if the question may have been interpreted to refer only to individuals as opposed to institutions providing care.

---

*Data and discussion on costs are included _supra_ in Volume II, Section VIII.

In Table 3-10 above it was reported that 19% of those using in-home care by relatives and 27% using care in relatives' homes would prefer other methods of care, about 10% of whom would still use relatives but would reverse the respective home setting. Respondents using relatives in-home preferred a wide variety of other methods (Table 3-11). In contrast, 60% of respondents using care in relatives' homes would prefer either day care centers or nursery schools. Of all households using care but preferring center or nursery school care over their current main methods (estimated at 1.7 million households) 62% would change from care by relatives.

If, at this point, the reader is confused about apparent inconsistencies between the number who say their first choice is relative and the numbers who would prefer other methods, the subjects of cost and availability should be introduced. When respondents were asked if they would prefer other methods, the questionnaire wording presupposed that "(they) could have any type of care (they) wanted." On the other hand the wording in Table 3-26 ("My first choice for someone to take care of my children is a relative") is probably more concrete and thus tended to foster reality testing. Consider the following item testing the importance of cost:

Statement: "The main advantage to having relatives take care of my children is that it is less expensive than having someone else take care of them." (Tables 3-28 and 3-29)

Less than 40% disagreed with the statement and clear majorities of both respondents in general and users of care by relatives in particular agreed with the statement. Nearly one in five users strongly agreed.

Two additional attitude items lend depth to our analysis of opinions on care by relatives:

Statement: "Relatives let children get away with too much." (Tables 3-30 and 3-31)

Comment: Those users of care by relatives expressing a non-neutral opinion were about equally divided on this issue. That about 40% of those using (and 45% of the population as a whole) agreed with the statement indicates that leniency or lack of discipline on the part of related caregivers is perceived as a widespread problem. Overall, only a third disagreed.

Statement: "I would rather pay someone to look after my children than leave them with relatives. (Tables 3-32 and 3-33)

Comment: Any interpretation of the results from this item tend to be confounded by whether or not relatives are available. Just under a quarter of all respondents agreed with the statement, probably indicating that about one in four mothers would distinctly prefer not to have relatives involved in their child care arrangements. (This is about the same proportion who disagreed with the statement in Table 3-26 asserting that their first choice would be a relative.) Eleven percent of those currently using care by relatives as their main method agreed with the statement (Table 3-33).

It is probably correct to infer, admittedly by enthymeme, that roughly 900,000 (11% of users) use care by relatives for cost and convenience reasons even though they would prefer other arrangements. It is also probable that about 600,000 current users of other methods would prefer care by relatives, often for economic reasons. The availability of relatives, however, renders this conclusion somewhat problematical.

Preferences for Care in Non-Relatives' Homes

About a third of those who used care in non-relatives' homes would prefer other methods of care (Table 3-10 above). This represents the highest level of propensity to change of all the user groups. Furthermore, only 3% of all users wishing to change their main method (approximately 125,000 households) would prefer care in non-relatives' homes. On the basis of these data, very few consumers would choose Family Day Care Homes without further information, encouragement, recruitment or the like.* The very few who selected "other home by non-relative" as their preferred type are almost exclusively white (Table 3-34 on the following page). Furthermore, despite policy trends toward promoting Family Day Care Homes through public assistance and job training programs, only a tiny proportion of the low-income subsample reported a preference for changing to this type of care (Table 3-35).**

The following attitude statements support the observations above:

Statement: "I would prefer to have my child taken care of in someone else's home over any other type of arrangement." (Tables 3-36 and 3-37)

Comment: Overall, 15% of all respondents agreed with the statement, a distribution which is largely dominated by those already using care in other persons' homes and those who had relatives' homes in mind. Of perhaps greatest importance is the fact that only 36% of those who used care in non-relatives' homes as their main methods agreed with the statement.

---

*The questionnaire category "other home by non-relative" is not strictly congruent to the Family Day Care Home concept.

**The estimate derived is 13,000 households. However, at this level of measurement the standard error of the estimate is about 50,000.

TABLE 3-34

Current Users Preferring Other Methods of Care
By Race/Ethnicity

	White		Black		Spanish		Other, Unknown		All Respondents	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
In own home:										
By relative	404	15.3	18	3.6	28	13.8	45	40.5	496	14.3
By non-relative	510	19.3	38	7.6	27	12.9	6	5.4	581	16.8
In other home:										
By relative	192	7.2	6	1.2	11	5.3	6	4.9	214	6.2
By non-relative	113	4.3	7	1.4	3	1.5	0	0.0	124	3.6
Nursery school	525	19.8	163	32.5	54	26.0	37	32.9	778	22.5
Day care center	487	18.4	196	39.0	48	23.5	12	10.3	742	21.4
Cooperative program	228	8.6	23	4.6	8	3.7	0	0.0	259	7.5
Before/after school program	156	5.9	31	6.2	10	4.8	0	0.0	197	5.7
Headstart	29	1.1	19	3.8	18	8.6	7	6.1	72	2.1
Total	2,643	100.0	502	100.0	206	100.0	112	100.0	3,463	-
Percent of base	-	76.3	-	14.5	-	5.9	-	3.2	-	100.0

TABLE 3-35

Current Users Preferring Other Methods of Care By Poverty Status

	Below Poverty		Within 200% of Poverty		Above 200% of Poverty		All Respondents	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
In own home:								
By relative	32	8.9	96	13.6	327	15.1	456	14.1
By non-relative	61	16.9	72	10.2	412	19.0	545	16.9
In other home:								
By relative	16	4.5	39	5.4	138	6.4	193	6.0
By non-relative	13	3.7	30	4.2	76	3.5	119	3.7
Nursery school	100	27.7	219	30.9	410	19.0	729	22.6
Day care center	80	22.1	167	23.6	454	21.0	701	21.7
Cooperative program	32	8.9	52	7.3	154	7.1	238	7.4
Before/after school program	18	5.0	12	1.7	154	7.1	184	5.7
Headstart	9	2.5	22	3.1	35	1.6	66	2.0
Total	362	100.0	708	100.0	2,160	100.0	3,230	-
Percent of base	-	11.2	-	21.9	-	66.9	-	100.0

Statement: "My child would not get enough personal attention in a Family Day Care Home." (Tables 3-38 and 3-39)

Comment: Only 63% of the sample(70% of those using care in non-relatives' homes) ventured a non-neutral opinion. As a measure of opinion per se, this item is of suspect validity. It is very likely, however, that the term "Family Day Care Home" is not widely used by consumers. This in itself is probably noteworthy, but there is no direct measure in the data of the awareness of consumers regarding Family Day Care Homes. It is possible that some of the 20% who agreed were thinking of foster homes.

Preferences for Centers and Nursery Schools

In Section II we advanced the proposition that the differences between day care centers and nursery schools, as reported in the data, were very likely to be artifacts of respondents' perceptions or semantics. Indeed, we know of no satisfactory categorical distinction between the two save perhaps the criterion that day care centers would usually operate a full-day program. The data confirm that the terms are equivocal:

Statement: "Day care centers and nursery schools are mostly the same thing." (Tables 3-40 and 3-41)

Comment: Fewer than one in three disagreed. Interestingly, 60% of day care center users agreed versus about 30% of nursery school users. While this might be interpreted to mean that nursery school users were actually able to discriminate between the care they purchase and center care, we suspect that status consciousness and/or snob appeal are at work. Most racial minority respondents agreed with the statement versus about one-third of whites.

In any event, demand for these two types of care, which we have conveniently labeled "institutional care," is manifest by a solid 1.7 million current users who would prefer nursery or center arrangements (Table 3-11). The biggest impediment, as we shall see in Section V, is probably cost.

The greatest proportional demand for institutional care can be attributed to blacks (Table 3-34). Yet on the whole, this demand is not limited to any particular racial group or income level (Table 3-35).

The questionnaire was rich with attitude statements on day care centers, most of which indicate widespread acceptance of this method of care:

Statement: "I would never send my child to a day care center." (Tables 3-42 and 3-43)

Comment: Two thirds of the available response disagreed with the statement and only 13% agreed. Of 4% who strongly agreed, it can be inferred that these respondents are mostly the same "maternal possessives" (our "polar group" from Section II) who strongly oppose almost anything to do with child care. Viewed on the whole, it is apparent that there is very little incidence of pro forma "concept rejection" of day care centers. The fact that 10% of nursery school users agreed probably means that even among those who agreed, surmountable terminological differences are influential. The old adage "there's one in every group!" was proven here by one center user who "would never send (my) child to a day care center."

Statement: "I don't like the kinds of children you find in places where groups of children are taken care of." (Tables 3-44 and 3-45)

Comment: This statement, although not focused on day care centers per se, was included as a measure of raw prejudice. If the results can be so construed, about one in eight (12% agreeing with the statement) can be considered to have preconceived class or race biases associated with institutional care.

Statement: "Day care centers are not open at the hours parents need them." (Tables 3-46 and 3-47)

Comment: One of the problems in interpreting this item arises because the statement can be taken as a cognitive fact as well as an attitude or opinion. That is, it is palpably true that most centers are not open at the hours that some parents need them (e.g., night shifts). On the other hand, the statement could be interpreted personally (i.e., are schedule difficulties a problem to me?) or generally (e.g., are most centers open when most parents need them). We are not sure how to interpret the overall distribution, but it is noteworthy that about one in four employed mothers agreed with the statement as did one in eight center users. These data probably validate that "hours" are a problem, but they offer little insight into the extent of the problem.

Statement: "The main advantage of day care centers is that children learn to get along with others." (Tables 3-48 and 3-49)

Comment: Only 8% disagreed with the statement. While it is somewhat difficult to interpret the importance of the term "main advantage," as opposed to, say, "big advantage," it is clear that at least 80% of the population felt that learning social skills is an important outcome of attending day care center programs. Less than a percent strongly disagreed.

Statement: "There is too much stress placed on trying to teach a child things in most places where children are taken care of." (Tables 3-50 and 3-51)

Comment: A third of all respondents fell into the "neutral" or "no opinion" categories, perhaps due to a reluctance to generalize beyond their experience (e.g., "most places"). Nearly one in four, however, agreed with the statement. While most nursery school and day care center users disagreed, those who agreed (15%) constitute a substantial minority opinion. Since the very ideas of teaching and, by extension, learning are probably considered to be desirable a priori, it must be considered significant that less than half of all respondents (and only weak majorities among center users) disagreed. This observation, coupled with the preceding statement on learning to get along with others, may be taken to mean that most mothers are more likely to support either play-oriented techniques or the traditional nursery school models of care than programs which are promoted with heavy emphasis on planned child developmental approaches. This conclusion is, however, dangerously beyond the instant data.

Statement: "Day care centers often have too wide a range of ages to do a good job caring for all of their children." (Tables 3-52 and 3-53)

Comment: About half of the sample was neutral or had no opinion, but 22% agreed. Fifty-six percent of center users disagreed versus about 50% of nursery school users. Center users who agreed (18%) evidently constitute a major critical grouping, although it cannot be inferred for certain that this proportion of users believed that the "criticism" applied to their arrangements. Also, nursery school users were slightly more likely to agree with the statement, an observation which sheds some light on what differences between the two forms of care may be perceived.

Statement: "I don't think that children get enough personal attention at day care centers." (Tables 3-54 and 3-55)

Comment: One in four agreed indicating that lack of "personal attention" is rather widely believed to be a shortcoming of center care. The structure of response patterns is about the same as in Tables 3-52 and 3-53 relating to age ranges, but it can be inferred that the issue of personal attention is the dominant of the two variables. Of particular importance, 21% of center users agreed with the statement.

Statement:	"My child would not get enough personal attention in a Family Day Care Home." (Tables 3-38 and 3-39)
Comment:	This statement was discussed above under preferences for Family Day Care Homes (pg. 3-23). By way of comparison, it is significant that the proportion of the population who felt their child would not get enough attention in Family Day Care Homes is about 6% lower than for day care centers.
Statement:	"I would worry about my child getting fed properly in places where groups of children are taken care of." (Tables 3-56 and 3-57)
Comment:	Our group of "maternal possessives" appears prominently on these tables, strongly agreeing with a vengeance. Overall, nearly one in three agreed with the statement. Once again, it must be pointed out that the word "worry" is probably excessively suggestive and pejorative. Yet is is still clear that nutrition is an important component in the composite consumer decision-making process.
Statement:	"Day care centers should accept infants." (Tables 3-58 and 3-59)
Comment:	This statement represents an issue which has been the focal point of a great deal of controversy. The public opinion is equally divided on the whole. Employed mothers were barely more likely to agree as were nursery school users. Still, opinions on this issue can probably be attributed more to general differences in parental philosophy than to current need or circumstances.

Care in day care centers has apparently achieved a widespread level of public acceptance. Perhaps this is due in part to extensive efforts to promote center care particularly during the late 1960s and early 1970s—a period of growth accompanied by extensive publicity and, especially among the poor, by recruitment and educational campaigns. In any event, there is a substantial current demand suspense, at least as measured by preference, and very few consumers summarily reject center care as being an undesirable method of care.

Preferences by Age of Child

As noted above, questions on preferred methods focused on alternatives to current main methods and cannot be linked deductively to individual children. The ages of the youngest children in responding households, however, provide a rough vehicle for analyzing preferences by children's ages.

Three quarters of those who would change their main methods had children under six (Table 3-60 on the following page).* Half of these "pre-school households" (55% of those with three-to-five year olds as the youngest) preferred formal institutional care. About a third of those with children aged two or younger chose in-home care, preferably by relatives.

Advocates of Family Day Care Homes will note that there is no substantial manifest preference for this form of care at any level. Indeed, very few mothers with younger children prefer this type of arrangement despite the popular assumption that this method of care offers more personal attention for younger children.

On the other hand, Family Day Care Homes have only recently been thought of as a formal component of the child care delivery system. Whatever the potential for acceptance and, hence, demand for Family Day Care Homes, public opinion and consciousness lie far behind.

---

*It may be worthwhile to restate the fact that the survey was taken midway through the year. Thus, half of the six year olds can also be considered to be pre-schoolers.

TABLE 3-60

Current Users Preferring Other Methods of Care By Age of Youngest Child

Preferred Method	0-2 Years Number	0-2 Years Percent	3-5 Years Number	3-5 Years Percent	6-9 Years Number	6-9 Years Percent	10-13 Years Number	10-13 Years Percent	All Respondents Number	All Respondents Percent
In own home:										
By relative	304	20.5	95	8.4	94	12.8	4	2.8	496	14.3
By non-relative	196	13.3	199	17.6	153	21.0	33	26.9	581	16.8
In other home:										
By relative	102	6.9	43	3.8	55	7.5	14	11.4	214	6.2
By non-relative	39	2.6	43	3.8	36	4.9	6	4.8	124	3.6
Nursery school	381	25.8	384	33.9	14	1.8	0	0.0	778	22.5
Day care center	295	19.9	242	21.4	187	25.6	19	15.3	742	21.4
Cooperative program	111	7.5	80	7.1	52	7.0	17	13.7	259	7.5
Before/after school program	4	0.3	21	1.8	141	19.4	31	25.0	197	5.7
Headstart	47	3.2	24	2.1	0	0.0	0	0.0	72	2.1
Total	1,479	100.0	1,130	100.0	731	100.0	124	100.0	3,464	-
Percent of base	-	42.7	-	32.6	-	21.1	-	3.6	-	100.0

TABLE 3-12

REACTICN TO THE STATEMENT:
I WOULD PREFER TO HAVE SOMEONE COME INTO MY HOME TO TAKE CARE OF MY CHILDREN OVER ANY OTHER TYPE OF ARRANGEMENT."
(WEIGHTED PERCENTS BASED ON ALL HOUSEHOLDS)

	STRONGLY AGREE	AGREE	NEUTRAL (NEITHER)	DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE	NO OPINION	TOTAL WEIGHTED	RAW
BY CURRENT MARITAL STATUS:								
MARRIED	26.0	28.7	18.0	22.2	3.6	1.4	20027	3435
NOT MARRIED	18.1	24.9	18.6	32.7	3.7	2.1	4342	1171
BY RESPONDENTS EMPLOYMENT STATUS:								
EMPLOYED(FULL/PART)	19.8	23.8	21.0	29.2	4.5	1.5	8934	1761
NOT EMPLOYED	27.1	30.5	16.5	21.2	3.1	1.5	15375	2835
BY RACE/ETNICITY:								
WHITE	27.6	29.0	18.8	20.3	2.8	1.5	18312	2543
BLACK	11.4	22.6	16.1	41.7	6.3	1.9	3507	1408
SPANISH/OTHER	21.0	28.3	16.5	27.0	5.8	1.5	2571	657
BY POVERTY STATUS:								
BELOW POVERTY	20.6	26.2	16.5	31.9	3.5	1.2	3212	856
WITHIN 200% OF	24.0	29.0	16.7	26.7	2.8	0.9	5285	1189
ABOVE 200% OF POV.	26.5	27.8	18.8	21.8	4.0	1.0	13127	2036
ALL RESPONDENTS	24.6	28.0	18.1	24.2	3.6	1.4	24390	4609

UNCO

TABLE 3-13

REACTION TO THE STATEMENT:
I WOULD PREFER TO HAVE SOMEONE COME INTO MY HOME TO TAKE CARE OF
MY CHILDREN OVER ANY OTHER TYPE OF ARRANGEMENT."
(WEIGHTED PERCENTS BY MAIN METHOD OF CARE)

	STRONGLY AGREE	AGREE	NEUTRAL (NEITHER)	DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE	NO OPINION	TOTAL WEIGHTED	RAW
IN HOME/RELATIVE	37.4	35.1	13.5	11.8	1.0	1.2	3418	633
IN HOME/NON-RELATIVE	44.3	30.6	13.1	9.5	1.0	1.5	3176	450
IN RELATIVE'S HOME	18.0	22.5	25.2	30.1	3.5	0.8	4136	841
IN NON-RELATIVES HOME	13.0	19.5	25.8	34.4	6.4	0.9	2513	441
NURSERY SCHOOL	5.9	10.2	18.2	48.8	13.9	3.0	874	180
DAYCARE CENTER	6.6	9.4	12.6	57.7	9.1	4.6	550	120
BEFORE/AFTER SCHOOL	20.8	28.8	26.6	20.2	2.9	0.6	308	56
HEADSTART	22.9	17.2	3.2	49.7	6.9	0.0	71	22
OTHER METHOD	24.8	26.2	22.8	22.7	3.5	0.0	551	95
NO MAIN METHOD	21.8	32.5	16.1	23.9	3.6	2.1	8754	1771
ALL RESPONDENTS	24.5	28.0	18.1	24.1	3.6	1.5	24350	4609

UNCO

TABLE 3-14

REACTION TO THE STATEMENT: "I WOULD'NT HAVE SITTERS COME INTO MY HOME TO TAKE CARE OF MY CHILDREN UNLESS I KNEW THEM VERY WELL." (WEIGHTED PERCENTS BASED ON ALL HOUSEHOLDS)

	STRONGLY AGREE	AGREE	NEUTRAL (NEITHER)	DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE	NO OPINION	TOTAL WEIGHTED	RAW
BY CURRENT MARITAL STATUS:								
MARRIED	41.4	43.3	6.7	6.5	0.7	1.4	20027	3435
NOT MARRIED	35.6	46.5	7.6	7.5	1.5	1.3	4342	1171
BY RESPONDENTS EMPLOYMENT STATUS:								
EMPLOYED(FULL/PART)	38.7	44.9	6.6	7.7	0.6	1.5	8934	1761
NOT EMPLOYED	41.2	43.3	7.1	6.2	1.0	1.3	15375	2835
BY RACE/ETNICITY:								
WHITE	40.8	43.2	7.2	6.8	0.7	1.4	18312	2543
BLACK	38.1	44.7	6.8	6.8	1.9	1.5	3507	1408
SPANISH/OTHER	40.3	47.3	4.9	5.9	0.3	1.2	2571	657
BY POVERTY STATUS:								
BELOW POVERTY	41.2	47.3	5.1	4.7	0.5	1.0	3212	856
WITHIN 200% OF	40.7	47.0	5.5	5.0	1.0	0.9	5285	1189
ABOVE 200% OF POV.	40.9	42.2	7.8	7.7	0.7	0.9	13127	2036
ALL RESPONDENTS	40.5	43.9	6.9	6.7	0.8	1.3	24390	4609

UNCO

TABLE 3-15

REACTION TO THE STATEMENT:
"I WOULDN'T HAVE SITTERS COME INTO MY HOME TO TAKE CARE OF MY CHILDREN
UNLESS I KNEW THEM VERY WELL."
(WEIGHTED PERCENTS BY MAIN METHOD OF CARE)

	STRONGLY AGREE	AGREE	NEUTRAL (NEITHER)	DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE	NO OPINION	TOTAL WEIGHTED	TOTAL RAW
IN HOME/RELATIVE	42.4	42.0	7.0	6.6	0.5	1.1	3418	633
IN HOME/NON-RELATIVE	33.1	44.4	10.4	9.6	1.0	1.6	3176	450
IN RELATIVE'S HOME	41.8	45.9	5.5	4.9	0.6	1.4	4136	841
IN NON-RELATIVES HOME	38.7	46.2	5.7	7.5	0.6	1.2	2513	441
NURSERY SCHOOL	46.1	34.0	8.7	7.0	1.1	3.0	874	180
DAYCARE CENTER	30.4	49.7	8.8	8.4	0.5	2.3	550	120
BEFORE/AFTER SCHOOL	34.8	43.5	12.8	9.0	0.0	0.0	308	56
HEADSTART	30.1	53.2	4.1	12.6	0.0	0.0	71	22
OTHER METHOD	35.4	49.8	6.7	8.1	0.0	0.0	591	95
NO MAIN METHOD	42.6	42.5	6.1	5.9	1.1	1.4	8754	1771
ALL RESPONDENTS	40.3	43.9	6.9	6.7	0.9	1.4	24350	4609

LACC

TABLE 3-16

REACTION TO THE STATEMENT:
"THE PEOPLE WHO HAVE COME INTO MY HOME TO TAKE CARE OF MY CHILDREN
HAVE ALWAYS TREATED MY HOME WITH RESPECT."
(WEIGHTED PERCENTS BASED ON ALL HOUSEHOLDS)

	STRONGLY AGREE	AGREE	NEUTRAL (NEITHER)	DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE	NO OPINION	TOTAL WEIGHTED	TOTAL RAW
BY CURRENT MARITAL STATUS:								
MARRIED	29.3	47.4	14.0	4.0	0.9	4.3	20027	3435
NOT MARRIED	23.6	42.9	22.1	6.2	1.1	4.1	4342	1171
BY RESPONDENTS EMPLOYMENT STATUS:								
EMPLOYED(FULL/PART)	24.5	48.0	17.0	5.2	1.3	3.9	8934	1761
NOT EMPLOYED	30.5	45.8	14.5	4.0	0.7	4.5	15375	2835
BY RACE/ETNICITY:								
WHITE	29.4	48.6	12.7	4.7	1.0	3.6	18312	2543
BLACK	22.8	42.7	24.0	3.8	1.2	5.6	3507	1408
SPANISH/OTHER	28.1	37.9	23.2	2.9	0.3	7.5	2571	657
BY POVERTY STATUS:								
BELOW POVERTY	26.6	40.3	21.4	3.9	0.5	7.3	3212	856
WITHIN 200% OF	26.3	47.6	16.9	3.8	1.0	4.5	5285	1189
ABOVE 200% OF POV.	29.8	49.4	12.3	5.0	1.1	2.4	13127	2036
ALL RESPONDENTS	28.3	46.8	15.3	4.4	0.9	4.1	24390	4609

UNCO

TABLE 3-17

REACTION TO THE STATEMENT:
"THE PEOPLE WHO HAVE COME INTO MY HOME TO TAKE CARE OF MY CHILDREN
HAVE ALWAYS TREATED MY HOME WITH RESPECT."
(WEIGHTED PERCENTS BY MAIN METHOD OF CARE)

	STRONGLY AGREE	AGREE	NEUTRAL (NEITHER)	DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE	NO OPINION	TOTAL WEIGHTED	TOTAL RAW
IN HOME/RELATIVE	42.5	45.9	6.4	3.1	0.5	1.6	3418	633
IN HOME/NON-RELATIVE	33.3	53.3	5.1	5.3	1.6	1.5	3176	450
IN RELATIVE'S HOME	28.9	50.2	15.4	3.1	0.2	2.2	4136	841
IN NON-RELATIVES HOME	25.2	47.7	16.4	6.9	1.4	2.4	2513	441
NURSERY SCHOOL	23.8	41.8	22.8	5.1	2.3	4.1	874	180
DAYCARE CENTER	19.6	48.4	18.4	5.5	2.7	5.3	550	120
BEFORE/AFTER SCHOOL	16.3	50.7	18.1	7.3	1.5	6.1	308	56
HEADSTART	34.5	53.5	12.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	71	22
OTHER METHOD	26.9	60.3	9.3	2.9	0.0	0.5	591	95
NO MAIN METHOD	23.1	41.7	21.9	4.4	0.9	8.1	8754	1771
ALL RESPONDENTS	28.3	46.6	19.4	4.4	0.9	4.3	24390	4609

UACC

TABLE 3-18

REACTION TO THE STATEMENT:
"I HAVE HAD TO CHANGE MY SITTERS OFTEN BECAUSE THEY HAVE BEEN SO UNDEPENDABLE."
(WEIGHTED PERCENTS BASED ON ALL HOUSEHOLDS)

	STRONGLY AGREE	AGREE	NEUTRAL (NEITHER)	DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE	NO OPINION	TOTAL WEIGHTED	RAW
BY CURRENT MARITAL STATUS:								
MARRIED	1.5	4.6	17.7	54.3	17.6	4.4	20027	3435
NOT MARRIED	3.8	7.8	20.6	49.3	14.8	3.7	4342	1171
BY RESPONDENTS EMPLOYMENT STATUS:								
EMPLOYED(FULL/PART)	2.5	5.9	17.2	53.0	17.6	3.7	8934	1761
NOT EMPLOYED	1.6	4.7	18.8	53.7	16.7	4.5	15375	2835
BY RACE/ETNICITY:								
WHITE	1.7	4.5	16.2	55.9	18.0	3.6	18312	2543
BLACK	2.9	7.6	22.7	47.2	15.1	4.5	3507	1408
SPANISH/OTHER	2.1	6.2	26.2	44.0	13.0	8.4	2571	657
BY POVERTY STATUS:								
BELOW POVERTY	2.7	5.9	21.2	51.2	13.2	5.8	3212	856
WITHIN 200% OF	2.3	5.5	18.0	53.9	16.1	4.3	5285	1189
ABOVE 200% OF POV.	1.6	5.0	16.5	54.6	19.3	2.9	13127	2036
ALL RESPONDENTS	1.9	5.2	18.1	53.5	17.2	4.1	24390	4609

UNCO

TABLE 3-19

REACTION TO THE STATEMENT:
"I HAVE HAD TO CHANGE MY SITTERS OFTEN BECAUSE
THEY HAVE BEEN SO UNDEPENDABLE."
(WEIGHTED PERCENTS BY MAIN METHOD OF CARE)

	STRONGLY AGREE	AGREE	NEUTRAL (NEITHER)	DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE	NO OPINION	TOTAL WEIGHTED	TOTAL RAW
IN HOME/RELATIVE	1.2	4.6	12.3	59.8	18.8	3.3	3418	633
IN HOME/NON-RELATIVE	2.4	5.5	7.5	62.5	20.0	2.1	3176	450
IN RELATIVE'S HOME	2.0	4.2	13.1	57.9	20.9	1.9	4136	841
IN NON-RELATIVES HOME	2.0	5.3	12.4	57.2	21.1	2.0	2513	441
NURSERY SCHOOL	5.4	2.6	14.1	56.8	16.7	4.4	874	180
DAYCARE CENTER	1.2	7.5	18.2	48.5	20.5	4.1	550	120
BEFORE/AFTER SCHOOL	1.9	7.4	11.7	54.6	16.2	8.3	308	56
HEADSTART	0.0	7.5	20.3	48.4	12.3	11.4	71	22
OTHER METHOD	1.1	8.3	19.4	52.0	15.1	4.0	591	95
NO MAIN METHOD	1.6	5.4	29.0	44.5	12.3	7.1	6754	1771
A L L RESPONDENTS	1.9	5.1	18.2	53.4	17.1	4.3	24390	4609

UNCC

TABLE 3-20

REACTION TO THE STATEMENT:
"IF I HAD SOMEONE COME INTO MY HOME TO STAY WITH MY CHILDREN,
I WOULD WORRY ABOUT THINGS DISAPPEARING."
(WEIGHTED PERCENTS BASED ON ALL HOUSEHOLDS)

	STRONGLY AGREE	AGREE	NEUTRAL (NEITHER)	DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE	NO OPINION	TOTAL WEIGHTED	TOTAL RAW
BY CURRENT MARITAL STATUS:								
MARRIED	4.0	12.0	17.4	51.7	13.3	1.6	20027	3435
NOT MARRIED	6.3	19.5	18.8	45.2	8.1	2.1	4342	1171
BY RESPONDENTS EMPLOYMENT STATUS:								
EMPLOYED(FULL/PART)	4.6	14.2	19.2	48.6	11.5	1.9	8934	1761
NOT EMPLOYED	4.3	12.9	16.8	51.6	12.8	1.5	15375	2835
BY RACE/ETNICITY:								
WHITE	3.6	10.9	18.3	52.4	13.5	1.4	18312	2543
BLACK	6.9	19.3	16.9	46.0	8.6	2.2	3507	1408
SPANISH/OTHER	7.3	23.0	14.3	43.7	8.9	2.8	2571	657
BY POVERTY STATUS:								
BELOW POVERTY	7.5	22.3	13.9	45.6	9.1	1.6	3212	856
WITHIN 200% OF	4.5	14.6	17.9	52.2	9.3	1.4	5285	1189
ABOVE 200% OF POV.	3.7	9.5	19.2	52.8	13.9	1.0	13127	2036
ALL RESPONDENTS	4.4	13.2	17.8	50.8	12.3	1.5	24390	4609

UNCO

TABLE 3-21

REACTION TO THE STATEMENT:
"IF I HAD SOMEONE COME INTO MY HOME TO STAY WITH MY CHILDREN,
I WOULD WORRY ABOUT THINGS DISAPPEARING."
(WEIGHTED PERCENTS BY MAIN METHOD OF CARE)

	STRONGLY AGREE	AGREE	NEUTRAL (NEITHER)	DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE	NO OPINION	TOTAL WEIGHTED	TOTAL RAW
IN HOME/RELATIVE	3.4	9.1	15.0	54.5	16.0	1.9	3418	633
IN HOME/NON-RELATIVE	2.2	5.0	14.2	56.9	20.2	1.5	3176	450
IN RELATIVE'S HOME	5.6	12.9	18.7	49.4	12.2	1.2	4136	841
IN NON-RELATIVES HOME	5.0	10.1	20.9	51.6	10.8	1.7	2513	441
NURSERY SCHOOL	6.2	9.3	25.1	35.7	20.4	3.4	874	180
DAYCARE CENTER	3.4	15.0	18.5	52.2	8.3	2.6	550	120
BEFORE/AFTER SCHOOL	6.3	12.1	16.1	62.9	2.6	0.0	308	56
HEADSTART	23.3	8.9	10.5	47.7	9.6	0.0	71	22
OTHER METHOD	4.2	10.4	18.3	52.1	15.0	0.0	591	95
NO MAIN METHOD	4.6	19.8	17.8	47.8	8.2	1.8	8754	1771
ALL RESPONDENTS	4.4	13.3	17.7	50.6	12.3	1.7	24390	4609

UNCO

TABLE 3-22

REACTION TO THE STATEMENT:
"THE TROUBLE WITH HAVING A PERSON COME INTO MY HOME TO TAKE CARE OF MY CHILDREN IS THAT THEY SOON GET TO KNOW TOO MUCH ABOUT ME."
(WEIGHTED PERCENTS BASED ON ALL HOUSEHOLDS)

	STRONGLY AGREE	AGREE	NEUTRAL (NEITHER)	DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE	NO OPINION	TOTAL WEIGHTED	TOTAL RAW
BY CURRENT MARITAL STATUS:								
MARRIED	2.6	9.1	19.2	57.4	8.9	2.8	20027	3435
NOT MARRIED	5.7	16.2	22.5	46.2	6.7	2.6	4342	1171
BY RESPONDENTS EMPLOYMENT STATUS:								
EMPLOYED(FULL/PART)	2.4	9.4	19.5	56.5	9.3	2.9	8934	1761
NOT EMPLOYED	3.6	10.9	20.0	54.7	8.1	2.6	15375	2835
BY RACE/ETNICITY:								
WHITE	1.9	7.3	19.9	59.1	9.4	2.4	18312	2543
BLACK	7.4	21.0	20.7	41.3	5.8	3.8	3507	1408
SPANISH/OTHER	6.3	17.1	17.5	48.7	6.4	4.1	2571	657
BY POVERTY STATUS:								
BELOW POVERTY	7.7	18.0	22.4	43.6	6.0	2.3	3212	856
WITHIN 200% OF	3.4	12.3	22.5	51.3	7.4	3.0	5285	1189
ABOVE 200% OF POV.	1.9	6.8	18.2	61.7	9.7	1.8	13127	2036
ALL RESPONDENTS	3.2	10.2	19.8	55.7	8.5	2.6	24390	4609

UNCO

TABLE 3-23

REACTION TO THE STATEMENT:
"THE TROUBLE WITH HAVING A PERSON COME INTO MY HOME TO TAKE CARE OF MY CHILDREN IS THAT THEY SOON GET TO KNOW TOO MUCH ABOUT ME."
(WEIGHTED PERCENTS BY MAIN METHOD OF CARE)

	STRONGLY AGREE	AGREE	NEUTRAL (NEITHER)	DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE	NO OPINION	TOTAL WEIGHTED	TOTAL RAW
IN HOME/RELATIVE	2.7	11.2	21.0	54.9	8.2	1.9	3418	633
IN HOME/NON-RELATIVE	0.6	3.5	14.1	66.8	13.4	1.6	3176	450
IN RELATIVE'S HOME	2.9	9.6	22.0	56.4	7.2	1.9	4136	841
IN NON-RELATIVES HOME	1.9	9.9	17.7	56.7	11.3	2.5	2513	441
NURSERY SCHOOL	2.9	6.0	18.3	53.9	15.4	3.5	874	180
DAYCARE CENTER	5.1	10.9	15.0	52.7	13.3	2.9	550	120
BEFORE/AFTER SCHOOL	1.6	4.4	19.3	62.4	7.2	5.1	308	56
HEADSTART	16.2	12.1	20.9	46.8	3.1	0.8	71	22
OTHER METHOD	3.0	7.7	27.7	53.5	8.0	0.0	591	99
NO MAIN METHOD	4.6	13.6	20.7	51.1	5.8	4.0	8754	1771
ALL RESPONDENTS	3.2	10.3	19.7	55.5	8.5	2.8	24350	4609

UNCC

TABLE 3-24

REACTION TO THE STATEMENT:
"A PERSON WHO CARES FOR MY CHILD(REN) SHOULD HELP AROUND THE HOUSE AS WELL."
(WEIGHTED PERCENTS BASED ON ALL HOUSEHOLDS)

	STRONGLY AGREE	AGREE	NEUTRAL (NEITHER)	DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE	NO OPINION	TOTAL	
							WEIGHTED	RAW
BY CURRENT MARITAL STATUS:								
MARRIED	2.1	15.4	17.1	54.2	9.1	2.0	20027	3435
NOT MARRIED	3.8	16.4	17.9	49.7	9.6	2.5	4342	1171
BY RESPONDENTS EMPLOYMENT STATUS:								
EMPLOYED(FULL/PART)	2.5	16.4	19.9	50.4	8.9	1.9	8934	1761
NOT EMPLOYED	2.4	15.2	15.8	55.1	9.3	2.1	15375	2835
BY RACE/ETNICITY:								
WHITE	1.9	15.7	17.9	53.7	8.9	1.9	18312	2543
BLACK	3.6	15.0	15.1	54.0	10.0	2.3	3507	1408
SPANISH/OTHER	4.8	16.0	15.6	50.4	9.9	3.2	2571	657
BY POVERTY STATUS:								
BELOW POVERTY	4.3	18.4	12.9	53.0	9.1	2.2	3212	856
WITHIN 200% OF	3.5	16.9	15.9	53.5	8.6	1.6	5285	1189
ABOVE 200% OF POV.	1.6	14.7	18.2	54.3	9.9	1.2	13127	2036
ALL RESPONDENTS	2.4	15.7	17.2	53.5	9.2	1.9	24390	4609

UNCO

TABLE 3-25

REACTION TO THE STATEMENT:
"A PERSON WHO CARES FOR MY CHILD(REN) SHOULD HELP AROUND THE HOUSE AS WELL."
(WEIGHTED PERCENTS BY MAIN METHOD OF CARE)

	STRONGLY AGREE	AGREE	NEUTRAL (NEITHER)	DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE	NO OPINION	TOTAL WEIGHTED	TOTAL RAW
IN HOME/RELATIVE	0.9	14.8	15.1	58.9	9.1	1.2	3418	633
IN HOME/NON-RELATIVE	2.5	14.8	17.6	54.1	9.5	1.6	3176	450
IN RELATIVE'S HOME	2.4	15.4	16.5	54.2	10.2	1.3	4136	841
IN NON-RELATIVES HOME	2.5	14.9	17.2	51.0	12.9	1.5	2513	441
NURSERY SCHOOL	2.9	9.9	13.8	53.0	17.3	3.2	874	180
DAYCARE CENTER	3.1	12.0	19.0	45.1	15.7	5.1	550	120
BEFORE/AFTER SCHOOL	0.0	28.3	30.3	39.8	1.6	0.0	308	56
HEADSTART	5.8	16.5	11.3	52.5	13.8	0.0	71	22
OTHER METHOD	0.8	14.8	25.9	54.5	3.7	0.3	551	95
NO MAIN METHOD	3.1	17.0	17.6	52.3	6.9	3.1	8754	1771
A L L RESPONDENTS	2.4	15.8	17.2	53.4	9.2	2.1	24350	4609

UNCC

TABLE 3-26

REACTION TO THE STATEMENT: "MY FIRST CHOICE FOR SOMEONE TO TAKE CARE OF MY CHILDREN IS A RELATIVE." (WEIGHTED PERCENTS BASED ON ALL HOUSEHOLDS)

	STRONGLY AGREE	AGREE	NEUTRAL (NEITHER)	DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE	NO OPINION	TOTAL WEIGHTED	RAW
BY CURRENT MARITAL STATUS:								
MARRIED	25.5	37.8	11.6	20.2	3.0	1.8	20027	3435
NOT MARRIED	23.6	37.1	11.6	23.7	2.4	1.5	4342	1171
BY RESPONDENTS EMPLOYMENT STATUS:								
EMPLOYED(FULL/PART)	22.2	33.6	11.1	27.4	3.9	1.8	8934	1761
NOT EMPLOYED	26.9	40.0	12.0	17.1	2.3	1.6	15375	2835
BY RACE/ETNICITY:								
WHITE	25.1	37.4	11.9	21.0	2.9	1.8	18312	2543
BLACK	24.4	37.0	12.5	22.0	2.3	1.7	3507	1408
SPANISH/OTHER	27.1	41.3	8.7	17.6	4.0	1.3	2571	657
BY POVERTY STATUS:								
BELOW POVERTY	25.9	43.8	9.3	18.2	1.5	1.4	3212	896
WITHIN 200% OF	27.6	42.2	10.4	17.2	1.3	1.3	5285	1189
ABOVE 200% OF POV.	23.4	35.6	13.0	23.4	3.8	0.9	13127	2036
ALL RESPONDENTS	25.1	37.9	11.7	20.9	2.9	1.6	24390	4609

UNCO

TABLE 3-27

REACTION TO THE STATEMENT:
"MY FIRST CHOICE FOR SOMEONE TO TAKE CARE OF MY CHILDREN IS A RELATIVE."
(WEIGHTED PERCENTS BY MAIN METHOD OF CARE)

	STRONGLY AGREE	AGREE	NEUTRAL (NEITHER)	DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE	NO OPINION	TOTAL WEIGHTED	RAW
IN HOME/RELATIVE	41.2	45.5	5.8	6.2	0.1	1.1	3418	633
IN HOME/NON-RELATIVE	13.4	31.2	16.2	34.4	2.7	2.0	3176	450
IN RELATIVE'S HOME	37.9	44.7	7.5	7.5	0.5	1.5	4136	841
IN NON-RELATIVES HOME	11.8	26.8	16.9	36.1	7.0	1.3	2513	441
NURSERY SCHOOL	12.0	26.6	11.4	37.6	9.4	3.0	874	180
DAYCARE CENTER	9.1	20.8	12.1	49.1	6.6	2.3	550	120
BEFORE/AFTER SCHOOL	15.9	55.6	5.0	22.3	1.2	0.0	308	56
HEADSTART	30.5	23.4	13.7	22.6	9.7	0.0	71	22
OTHER METHOD	27.1	34.1	16.3	20.8	1.8	0.0	551	95
NO MAIN METHOD	23.5	38.8	12.4	19.9	3.2	2.1	8754	1771
ALL RESPONDENTS	25.2	37.7	11.7	20.8	2.9	1.7	24350	4609

UNCO

TABLE 3-28

REACTION TO THE STATEMENT:
"THE MAIN ADVANTAGE TO HAVING RELATIVES TAKE CARE OF MY CHILDREN IS THAT IT IS LESS EXPENSIVE THAN HAVING ANYONE ELSE TAKE CARE OF THEM."
(WEIGHTED PERCENTS BASED ON ALL HOUSEHOLDS)

	STRONGLY AGREE	AGREE	NEUTRAL (NEITHER)	DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE	NO OPINION	TOTAL WEIGHTED	RAW
BY CURRENT MARITAL STATUS:								
MARRIED	12.4	32.3	12.9	35.0	5.3	2.0	20027	3435
NOT MARRIED	17.0	40.2	12.5	24.6	3.3	2.5	4342	1171
BY RESPONDENTS EMPLOYMENT STATUS:								
EMPLOYED(FULL/PART)	12.3	34.5	14.5	32.7	4.0	2.0	8934	1761
NOT EMPLOYED	13.9	33.3	12.0	33.4	5.5	2.0	15375	2835
BY RACE/ETNICITY:								
WHITE	12.2	31.9	13.0	35.9	5.0	2.0	18312	2543
BLACK	17.6	38.6	13.6	24.9	3.0	2.2	3507	1408
SPANISH/OTHER	14.5	40.2	10.9	24.8	7.5	2.2	2571	657
BY POVERTY STATUS:								
BELOW POVERTY	17.7	42.5	12.1	20.3	5.8	1.6	3212	856
WITHIN 200% OF	15.3	38.5	9.5	30.9	3.9	2.0	5285	1189
ABOVE 200% OF POV.	11.4	31.0	13.9	37.1	5.4	1.2	13127	2036
ALL RESPONDENTS	13.3	33.9	12.8	33.2	5.0	1.9	24390	4609

UNCO

TABLE 3-29

REACTION TO THE STATEMENT:
"THE MAIN ADVANTAGE TO HAVING RELATIVES TAKE CARE OF MY CHILDREN IS THAT
IT IS LESS EXPENSIVE THAN HAVING ANYONE ELSE TAKE CARE OF THEM."
(WEIGHTED PERCENTS BY MAIN METHOD OF CARE)

	STRONGLY AGREE	AGREE	NEUTRAL (NEITHER)	DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE	NO OPINION	TOTAL WEIGHTED	TOTAL RAW
IN HOME/RELATIVE	19.2	32.3	9.3	33.6	4.6	1.1	3418	633
IN HOME/NON-RELATIVE	9.7	33.7	13.2	36.6	4.8	1.9	3176	450
IN RELATIVE'S HOME	17.0	34.8	10.8	31.6	4.2	1.7	4136	841
IN NON-RELATIVES HOME	9.1	32.7	16.6	33.6	6.2	1.8	2513	441
NURSERY SCHOOL	15.3	31.9	15.8	29.2	4.8	3.0	874	180
DAYCARE CENTER	9.8	33.5	19.5	27.3	7.3	2.1	550	120
BEFORE/AFTER SCHOOL	20.0	34.0	7.4	34.2	4.3	0.0	308	56
HEADSTART	34.6	38.4	0.0	21.8	5.2	0.0	71	22
OTHER METHOD	12.5	30.9	17.1	35.7	3.9	0.0	551	95
NO MAIN METHOD	11.3	34.4	13.3	33.0	5.2	2.8	8754	1771
ALL RESPONDENTS	13.2	33.7	12.9	33.1	5.0	2.0	24390	4609

UNCC

TABLE 3-30

REACTION TO THE STATEMENT:
"RELATIVES LET CHILDREN GET AWAY WITH TOO MUCH."
(WEIGHTED PERCENTS BASED ON ALL HOUSEHOLDS)

	STRONGLY AGREE	AGREE	NEUTRAL (NEITHER)	DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE	NO OPINION	TOTAL WEIGHTED	RAW
BY CURRENT MARITAL STATUS:								
MARRIED	11.9	31.9	16.5	34.8	3.1	1.8	20027	3435
NOT MARRIED	13.9	35.5	18.2	27.4	3.4	1.7	4342	1171
BY RESPONDENTS EMPLOYMENT STATUS:								
EMPLOYED(FULL/PART)	11.5	32.4	18.3	32.6	3.3	1.8	8934	1761
NOT EMPLOYED	12.6	32.8	15.8	34.0	3.1	1.7	15375	2835
BY RACE/ETNICITY:								
WHITE	12.0	30.3	16.8	36.4	2.9	1.7	18312	2543
BLACK	15.3	38.5	17.0	23.6	3.7	1.9	3507	1408
SPANISH/OTHER	9.5	41.1	16.3	26.4	4.5	2.2	2571	657
BY POVERTY STATUS:								
BELOW POVERTY	14.8	34.8	17.6	28.3	3.3	1.1	3212	856
WITHIN 200% OF	13.8	36.7	15.1	30.3	2.8	1.5	5285	1189
ABOVE 200% OF POV.	11.2	30.2	17.6	36.3	3.6	1.1	13127	2036
ALL RESPONDENTS	12.3	32.6	16.8	33.5	3.2	1.6	24390	4609

UNCO

TABLE 3-31

REACTION TO THE STATEMENT:
"RELATIVES LET CHILDREN GET AWAY WITH TOO MUCH."
(WEIGHTED PERCENTS BY MAIN METHOD OF CARE)

	STRONGLY AGREE	AGREE	NEUTRAL (NEITHER)	DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE	NO OPINION	TOTAL WEIGHTED	TOTAL RAW
IN HOME/RELATIVE	12.6	26.9	15.0	40.3	4.1	1.1	3418	633
IN HOME/NON-RELATIVE	8.3	33.6	17.1	37.4	2.0	1.6	3176	450
IN RELATIVE'S HOME	12.6	32.8	13.9	35.7	3.9	1.1	4136	841
IN NON-RELATIVES HOME	11.7	28.0	18.5	25.3	4.8	1.7	2513	441
NURSERY SCHOOL	20.1	32.6	16.5	24.5	1.3	3.0	874	180
DAYCARE CENTER	6.4	47.2	24.9	18.3	1.1	2.1	550	120
BEFORE/AFTER SCHOOL	16.0	17.7	27.3	38.0	1.0	0.0	308	56
HEADSTART	22.7	25.0	11.2	37.7	3.4	0.0	71	22
OTHER METHOD	12.0	27.1	21.1	37.4	0.8	1.7	551	55
NO MAIN METHOD	12.8	35.7	16.9	29.2	3.0	2.3	8754	1771
ALL RESPONDENTS	12.2	32.6	16.8	23.5	3.2	1.7	24390	4609

TABLE 3-32

REACTION TO THE STATEMENT:
"I WOULD RATHER PAY SOMEONE TO LOOK AFTER MY CHILDREN THAN LEAVE THEM WITH RELATIVES."
(WEIGHTED PERCENTS BASED ON ALL HOUSEHOLDS)

	STRONGLY AGREE	AGREE	NEUTRAL (NEITHER)	DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE	NO OPINION	TOTAL WEIGHTED	RAW
BY CURRENT MARITAL STATUS:								
MARRIED	4.9	18.6	18.3	46.6	9.7	1.9	20027	3435
NOT MARRIED	7.1	17.4	18.8	44.1	10.3	2.2	4342	1171
BY RESPONDENTS EMPLOYMENT STATUS:								
EMPLOYED(FULL/PART)	6.4	21.7	18.9	44.0	7.4	1.7	8934	1761
NOT EMPLOYED	4.6	16.7	18.2	47.3	11.2	2.1	15375	2835
BY RACE/ETNICITY:								
WHITE	5.0	19.2	18.0	45.7	10.1	1.9	18312	2543
BLACK	5.8	15.9	18.9	47.9	9.3	2.1	3507	1408
SPANISH/OTHER	6.1	16.1	20.1	46.8	8.5	2.4	2571	657
BY POVERTY STATUS:								
BELOW POVERTY	7.8	12.6	16.8	50.6	10.1	2.2	3212	856
WITHIN 200% OF	5.0	17.7	16.3	49.6	10.1	1.4	5285	1189
ABOVE 200% OF POV.	5.1	19.7	20.3	44.2	9.5	1.2	13127	2036
ALL RESPONDENTS	5.3	18.4	18.5	46.2	9.8	1.9	24390	4609

UNCO

TABLE 3-33

REACTION TO THE STATEMENT:
"I WOULD RATHER PAY SOMEONE TO LOOK AFTER MY CHILDREN THAN LEAVE THEM WITH RELATIVES."
(WEIGHTED PERCENTS BY MAIN METHOD OF CARE)

	STRONGLY AGREE	AGREE	NEUTRAL (NEITHER)	DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE	NO OPINION	TOTAL WEIGHTED	RAW
IN HOME/RELATIVE	3.1	8.0	16.1	54.6	16.8	1.3	3418	633
IN HOME/NON-RELATIVE	6.3	29.7	21.9	36.0	4.3	1.8	3176	450
IN RELATIVE'S HOME	2.5	8.6	11.4	60.2	15.8	1.4	4136	841
IN NON-RELATIVES HOME	6.6	26.2	24.0	35.1	6.3	1.7	2513	441
NURSERY SCHOOL	15.6	25.8	19.6	27.2	8.5	3.2	874	180
DAYCARE CENTER	6.8	26.4	19.8	41.8	3.1	2.1	550	120
BEFORE/AFTER SCHOOL	0.9	17.5	13.7	66.9	1.0	0.0	308	56
HEADSTART	9.5	26.8	8.8	35.7	17.2	0.0	71	22
OTHER METHOD	4.9	20.9	20.8	41.4	12.1	0.0	591	95
NO MAIN METHOD	5.6	19.4	19.5	44.8	7.9	2.8	8754	1771
A L L RESPONDENTS	5.3	18.4	18.4	46.1	9.8	2.0	24390	4609

TABLE 3-36

REACTION TO THE STATEMENT: "I WOULD PREFER TO HAVE MY CHILD TAKEN CARE OF IN SOMEONE ELSE'S HOME OVER ANY OTHER TYPE OF ARRANGEMENT."

(WEIGHTED PERCENTS BASED ON ALL HOUSEHOLDS)

	STRONGLY AGREE	AGREE	NEUTRAL (NEITHER)	DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE	NO OPINION	TOTAL WEIGHTED	RAW
BY CURRENT MARITAL STATUS:								
MARRIED	2.5	11.3	16.0	58.0	10.4	1.8	20027	3435
NOT MARRIED	3.4	14.3	19.3	48.8	12.0	2.2	4342	1171
BY RESPONDENTS EMPLOYMENT STATUS:								
EMPLOYED(FULL/PART)	3.2	12.8	16.7	55.6	9.7	1.9	8934	1761
NOT EMPLOYED	2.4	11.2	16.6	56.8	11.2	1.7	15375	2835
BY RACE/ETNICITY:								
WHITE	2.5	11.2	16.4	57.9	10.2	1.8	18312	2543
BLACK	4.1	13.7	18.8	52.3	9.0	2.1	3507	1408
SPANISH/OTHER	2.2	13.9	15.1	51.1	16.0	1.6	2571	657
BY POVERTY STATUS:								
BELOW POVERTY	3.6	10.9	18.7	53.2	12.1	1.5	3212	856
WITHIN 200% OF	3.1	14.7	17.2	54.3	9.2	1.6	5285	1189
ABOVE 200% OF POV.	2.2	10.8	15.5	58.8	11.4	1.2	13127	2036
ALL RESPONDENTS	2.7	11.8	16.6	56.5	10.7	1.7	24390	4609

UNCO

TABLE 3-37

REACTION TO THE STATEMENT:
"I WOULD PREFER TO HAVE MY CHILD TAKEN CARE OF IN SOMEONE ELSE'S
HOME OVER ANY OTHER TYPE OF ARRANGEMENT."
(WEIGHTED PERCENTS BY MAIN METHOD OF CARE)

	STRONGLY AGREE	AGREE	NEUTRAL (NEITHER)	DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE	NO OPINION	TOTAL WEIGHTED	RAW
IN HOME/RELATIVE	1.5	6.2	13.8	61.0	15.8	1.7	3418	633
IN HOME/NON-RELATIVE	0.0	5.7	10.6	68.1	14.0	1.6	3176	450
IN RELATIVE'S HOME	4.3	15.3	22.9	49.2	6.5	1.9	4136	841
IN NON-RELATIVES HOME	8.6	27.8	18.5	39.7	4.3	1.1	2513	441
NURSERY SCHOOL	0.0	6.5	19.5	50.5	20.4	3.0	874	180
DAYCARE CENTER	2.7	9.1	11.3	60.8	11.6	4.6	550	120
BEFORE/AFTER SCHOOL	5.1	7.9	12.6	65.3	9.1	0.0	308	56
HEADSTART	5.8	13.1	17.7	55.4	8.1	0.0	71	22
OTHER METHOD	0.5	10.5	17.9	59.7	10.5	1.0	591	99
NO MAIN METHOD	2.0	10.9	16.5	58.3	10.2	2.1	8754	1771
ALL RESPONDENTS	2.7	11.8	16.6	56.4	10.6	1.8	24390	4609

LACC

TABLE 3-38

REACTION TO THE STATEMENT: "MY CHILD WOULD NOT GET ENOUGH PERSONAL ATTENTION IN A FAMILY DAYCARE HOME." (WEIGHTED PERCENTS BASED ON ALL HOUSEHOLDS)

	STRONGLY AGREE	AGREE	NEUTRAL (NEITHER)	DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE	NO OPINION	TOTAL WEIGHTED	RAW
BY CURRENT MARITAL STATUS:								
MARRIED	3.5	15.8	33.2	39.4	3.1	5.0	20027	3435
NOT MARRIED	3.9	17.1	31.6	39.6	3.1	4.7	4342	1171
BY RESPONDENTS EMPLOYMENT STATUS:								
EMPLOYED(FULL/PART)	2.1	12.7	30.7	46.1	4.0	4.3	8934	1761
NOT EMPLOYED	4.4	18.0	34.3	35.5	2.5	5.3	15375	2835
BY RACE/ETNICITY:								
WHITE	3.0	15.6	34.6	39.2	2.7	4.8	18312	2543
BLACK	4.5	17.9	27.5	40.9	5.0	4.1	3507	1408
SPANISH/OTHER	6.3	16.8	28.1	38.6	3.3	6.9	2571	657
BY POVERTY STATUS:								
BELOW POVERTY	4.8	19.8	28.1	37.3	4.5	5.4	3212	856
WITHIN 200% OF	3.5	16.3	31.6	40.0	2.9	5.8	5285	1189
ABOVE 200% OF POV.	3.0	15.2	34.2	41.4	3.0	3.2	13127	2036
ALL RESPONDENTS	3.5	16.1	32.9	39.6	3.1	4.8	24390	4609

UNCO

TABLE 3-39

REACTION TO THE STATEMENT:
"MY CHILD WOULD NOT GET ENOUGH PERSONAL ATTENTION
IN A FAMILY DAYCARE HOME."
(WEIGHTED PERCENTS BY MAIN METHOD OF CARE)

	STRONGLY AGREE	AGREE	NEUTRAL (NEITHER)	DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE	NO OPINION	TOTAL WEIGHTED	TOTAL RAW
IN HOME/RELATIVE	3.1	16.2	35.1	39.3	2.3	4.1	3418	633
IN HOME/NON-RELATIVE	2.6	15.9	35.0	39.2	1.9	5.3	3176	450
IN RELATIVE'S HOME	2.8	13.7	32.7	43.7	3.6	3.5	4136	841
IN NON-RELATIVES HOME	2.0	13.5	27.1	46.8	7.6	2.9	2513	441
NURSERY SCHOOL	2.9	10.1	30.7	47.8	5.5	3.0	874	180
DAYCARE CENTER	2.3	8.8	25.6	53.2	7.3	2.8	550	120
BEFORE/AFTER SCHOOL	1.6	12.7	31.7	49.9	4.1	0.0	308	56
HEADSTART	3.4	41.4	8.3	41.0	5.1	0.8	71	22
OTHER METHOD	4.2	15.0	40.6	37.0	3.2	0.0	591	95
NO MAIN METHOD	5.0	19.0	33.5	33.4	1.7	7.3	8754	1771
ALL RESPONDENTS	3.6	16.1	32.9	39.4	3.1	5.0	24390	4609

UACC

TABLE 3-40

REACTION TO THE STATEMENT:
"DAYCARE CENTERS AND NURSERY SCHOOLS ARE MOSTLY THE SAME THING."
(WEIGHTED PERCENTS BASED ON ALL HOUSEHOLDS)

	STRONGLY AGREE	AGREE	NEUTRAL (NEITHER)	DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE	NO OPINION	TOTAL WEIGHTED	RAW
BY CURRENT MARITAL STATUS:								
MARRIED	5.0	30.7	27.1	25.7	3.6	7.9	20027	3435
NOT MARRIED	6.9	36.5	23.2	22.4	3.3	7.7	4342	1171
BY RESPONDENTS EMPLOYMENT STATUS:								
EMPLOYED(FULL/PART)	3.5	33.4	25.6	26.6	4.0	6.9	8934	1761
NOT EMPLOYED	6.4	30.9	26.8	24.2	3.3	8.3	15375	2835
BY RACE/ETNICITY:								
WHITE	4.5	28.4	27.8	28.1	3.6	7.5	18312	2543
BLACK	8.0	43.7	21.4	16.3	4.2	6.3	3507	1408
SPANISH/OTHER	7.3	40.1	22.7	15.8	2.0	12.1	2571	657
BY POVERTY STATUS:								
BELOW POVERTY	9.3	40.3	22.9	14.4	2.7	10.4	3212	856
WITHIN 200% OF	5.2	36.5	26.2	20.9	2.5	8.7	5285	1189
ABOVE 200% OF POV.	4.3	27.5	27.8	30.3	4.5	5.7	13127	2036
ALL RESPONDENTS	5.3	31.8	26.4	25.2	3.6	7.7	24390	4609

UNCO

TABLE 3-41

REACTION TO THE STATEMENT:
"DAYCARE CENTERS AND NURSERY SCHOOLS ARE MOSTLY THE SAME THING."
(WEIGHTED PERCENTS BY MAIN METHOD OF CARE)

	STRONGLY AGREE	AGREE	NEUTRAL (NEITHER)	DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE	NO OPINION	TOTAL WEIGHTED	TOTAL RAW
IN HOME/RELATIVE	5.5	31.2	30.4	23.9	2.0	7.1	3418	633
IN HOME/NON-RELATIVE	5.1	28.7	21.4	33.8	4.7	6.3	3176	450
IN RELATIVE'S HOME	4.0	35.5	28.3	24.2	2.2	5.8	4136	841
IN NON-RELATIVES HOME	2.7	28.6	26.6	29.7	6.1	4.4	2513	441
NURSERY SCHOOL	3.3	28.2	20.3	31.2	13.1	3.9	874	180
DAYCARE CENTER	5.0	54.0	8.0	27.6	2.4	3.0	550	120
BEFORE/AFTER SCHOOL	5.2	35.0	21.5	24.0	5.8	8.5	308	56
HEADSTART	3.4	64.4	15.8	4.7	5.1	6.6	71	22
OTHER METHOD	5.2	23.9	26.2	37.1	0.0	5.6	551	55
NO MAIN METHOD	7.0	31.6	27.0	20.1	2.9	11.5	8754	1771
ALL RESPONDENTS	5.3	31.8	26.4	25.1	3.5	7.8	24350	4609

UNCC

TABLE 3-42

REACTION TO THE STATEMENT:
"I WOULD NEVER SEND MY CHILD TO A DAYCARE CENTER."
(WEIGHTED PERCENTS BASED ON ALL HOUSEHOLDS)

	STRONGLY AGREE	AGREE	NEUTRAL (NEITHER)	DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE	NO OPINION	TOTAL WEIGHTED	RAW
BY CURRENT MARITAL STATUS:								
MARRIED	4.1	10.0	20.6	51.8	10.5	3.0	20027	3435
NOT MARRIED	3.7	6.9	17.1	53.8	15.7	2.9	4342	1171
BY RESPONDENTS EMPLOYMENT STATUS:								
EMPLOYED(FULL/PART)	2.3	7.9	17.8	53.9	15.1	3.0	8934	1761
NOT EMPLOYED	5.0	10.4	21.3	51.1	9.3	2.9	15375	2835
BY RACE/ETNICITY:								
WHITE	4.1	10.2	21.3	50.5	10.9	2.9	18312	2543
BLACK	2.6	5.4	14.2	57.7	17.3	2.8	3507	1408
SPANISH/OTHER	5.8	9.2	18.4	56.6	6.5	3.4	2571	657
BY POVERTY STATUS:								
BELOW POVERTY	4.8	8.5	19.1	54.5	10.6	2.5	3212	856
WITHIN 200% OF	3.7	7.8	21.8	52.1	11.0	3.6	5285	1189
ABOVE 200% OF POV.	3.9	9.6	18.8	53.4	12.7	1.7	13127	2036
ALL RESPONDENTS	4.0	9.3	19.9	52.4	11.5	2.8	24390	4609

UNCO

TABLE 3-43

REACTION TO THE STATEMENT:
"I WOULD NEVER SEND MY CHILD TO A DAYCARE CENTER."
(WEIGHTED PERCENTS BY MAIN METHOD OF CARE)

	STRONGLY AGREE	AGREE	NEUTRAL (NEITHER)	DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE	NO OPINION	TOTAL WEIGHTED	RAW
IN HOME/RELATIVE	3.2	10.4	23.1	51.2	9.5	2.6	3418	633
IN HOME/NON-RELATIVE	3.8	9.4	23.1	49.9	10.2	3.6	3176	450
IN RELATIVE'S HOME	3.8	6.7	20.4	55.5	11.2	2.4	4136	641
IN NON-RELATIVES HOME	3.1	5.8	15.9	54.5	18.9	1.7	2513	441
NURSERY SCHOOL	1.6	9.1	6.3	53.4	25.5	4.2	874	180
DAYCARE CENTER	0.0	0.7	3.8	50.5	40.4	4.6	550	120
BEFORE/AFTER SCHOOL	5.8	12.7	15.5	59.2	6.8	0.0	308	56
HEADSTART	0.0	3.4	24.4	40.8	31.4	0.0	71	22
OTHER METHOD	5.7	6.7	23.6	51.9	10.2	1.9	591	55
NO MAIN METHOD	5.3	12.1	20.8	51.0	7.3	3.6	8754	1771
ALL RESPONDENTS	4.1	9.4	20.0	52.2	11.4	3.0	24350	4609

UNCC

TABLE 3-44

REACTION TO THE STATEMENT:
"I DON'T LIKE THE KINDS OF CHILDREN YOU FIND IN PLACES WHERE GROUPS OF CHILDREN ARE TAKEN CARE OF."
(WEIGHTED PERCENTS BASED ON ALL HOUSEHOLDS)

	STRONGLY AGREE	AGREE	NEUTRAL (NEITHER)	DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE	NO OPINION	TOTAL WEIGHTED	TOTAL RAW
BY CURRENT MARITAL STATUS:								
MARRIED	3.2	8.7	30.3	44.8	8.3	4.7	20027	3435
NOT MARRIED	3.8	12.0	29.7	42.1	8.1	4.2	4342	1171
BY RESPONDENTS EMPLOYMENT STATUS:								
EMPLOYED(FULL/PART)	2.8	9.1	28.2	47.2	9.0	3.7	8934	1761
NOT EMPLOYED	3.6	9.4	31.3	42.6	7.9	5.2	15375	2835
BY RACE/ETNICITY:								
WHITE	3.0	7.8	32.4	43.5	8.5	4.8	18312	2543
BLACK	5.1	14.4	21.6	47.8	8.4	2.8	3507	1408
SPANISH/OTHER	2.8	13.3	26.1	45.0	6.6	6.2	2571	657
BY POVERTY STATUS:								
BELOW POVERTY	5.4	12.5	31.8	38.6	6.1	5.5	3212	856
WITHIN 200% OF	3.4	10.0	28.3	46.2	6.3	5.8	5285	1189
ABOVE 200% OF POV.	2.7	7.3	31.1	45.9	9.8	3.2	13127	2036
ALL RESPONDENTS	3.3	9.2	30.2	44.4	8.3	4.5	24390	4609

UNCO

TABLE 3-45

REACTION TO THE STATEMENT:
"I DON'T LIKE THE KINDS OF CHILDREN YOU FIND IN PLACES WHERE
GROUPS OF CHILDREN ARE TAKEN CARE OF."
(WEIGHTED PERCENTS BY MAIN METHOD OF CARE)

	STRONGLY AGREE	AGREE	NEUTRAL (NEITHER)	DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE	NO OPINION	TOTAL WEIGHTED	TOTAL RAW
IN HOME/RELATIVE	2.6	9.0	33.3	42.9	8.2	3.9	3418	633
IN HOME/NON-RELATIVE	1.5	10.1	31.2	44.0	9.0	4.2	3176	450
IN RELATIVE'S HOME	3.4	8.1	32.6	45.2	6.9	3.8	4136	841
IN NON-RELATIVES HOME	2.3	7.3	28.4	48.3	11.0	2.7	2513	441
NURSERY SCHOOL	1.8	3.3	23.0	53.0	15.9	3.0	874	180
DAYCARE CENTER	0.7	4.6	13.8	59.4	16.8	4.6	550	120
BEFORE/AFTER SCHOOL	4.2	7.4	26.7	47.8	10.8	3.1	308	56
HEADSTART	16.8	14.8	4.9	58.5	4.9	0.0	71	22
OTHER METHOD	1.7	10.1	35.7	35.7	12.6	4.1	551	95
NO MAIN METHOD	4.8	11.1	29.5	41.8	6.3	6.4	8754	1771
ALL RESPONDENTS	3.3	9.3	30.2	44.3	8.3	4.7	24390	4609

LACC

TABLE 3-46

REACTION TO THE STATEMENT:
"DAY CARE CENTERS ARE NOT OPEN AT THE HOURS PARENTS NEED THEM."
(WEIGHTED PERCENTS BASED ON ALL HOUSEHOLDS)

	STRONGLY AGREE	AGREE	NEUTRAL (NEITHER)	DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE	NO OPINION	TOTAL WEIGHTED	TOTAL RAW
BY CURRENT MARITAL STATUS:								
MARRIED	5.8	16.6	35.7	28.3	3.3	10.4	20027	3435
NOT MARRIED	8.6	23.8	27.7	28.6	4.3	7.2	4342	1171
BY RESPONDENTS EMPLOYMENT STATUS:								
EMPLOYED(FULL/PART)	7.5	18.1	31.5	30.2	3.6	9.0	8934	1761
NOT EMPLOYED	5.6	17.5	35.9	27.3	3.4	10.3	15375	2835
BY RACE/ETNICITY:								
WHITE	5.2	14.8	37.4	29.3	3.1	10.1	18312	2543
BLACK	11.0	26.2	22.3	29.0	5.4	6.1	3507	1408
SPANISH/OTHER	7.1	27.9	28.3	20.3	3.0	13.4	2571	657
BY POVERTY STATUS:								
BELOW POVERTY	11.6	24.6	27.5	22.9	2.4	10.9	3212	856
WITHIN 200% OF	7.1	20.6	29.1	28.8	3.5	10.9	5285	1189
ABOVE 200% OF POV.	4.8	15.7	36.7	30.7	3.8	8.2	13127	2036
ALL RESPONDENTS	6.3	17.9	34.1	28.5	3.5	9.7	24390	4609

UNCO

TABLE 3-47

REACTION TO THE STATEMENT:
"DAY CARE CENTERS ARE NOT OPEN AT THE HOURS PARENTS NEED THEM."
(WEIGHTED PERCENTS BY MAIN METHOD OF CARE)

	STRONGLY AGREE	AGREE	NEUTRAL (NEITHER)	DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE	NO OPINION	TOTAL WEIGHTED	TOTAL RAW
IN HOME/RELATIVE	5.0	16.4	34.1	30.8	4.3	9.4	3418	633
IN HOME/NON-RELATIVE	6.1	16.4	35.4	30.3	4.3	7.5	3176	450
IN RELATIVE'S HOME	7.2	16.6	33.8	30.8	3.2	8.4	4136	841
IN NON-RELATIVES HOME	7.0	16.2	30.3	33.9	4.5	8.1	2513	441
NURSERY SCHOOL	5.8	17.6	24.0	37.8	11.1	3.6	874	180
DAYCARE CENTER	3.0	8.9	13.9	59.2	12.4	2.6	550	120
BEFORE/AFTER SCHOOL	3.2	13.3	37.7	27.7	0.5	17.6	308	56
HEADSTART	10.9	27.5	11.3	34.2	5.1	11.0	71	22
OTHER METHOD	6.2	22.8	37.7	24.3	0.5	8.5	551	55
NO MAIN METHOD	6.5	20.3	37.4	21.3	1.6	12.9	8754	1771
ALL RESPONDENTS	6.3	17.8	34.3	28.3	3.5	9.8	24350	4609

UNCC

TABLE 3-48

REACTION TO THE STATEMENT: "THE MAIN ADVANTAGE OF DAYCARE CENTERS IS THAT CHILDREN LEARN TO GET ALONG WITH OTHERS."

(WEIGHTED PERCENTS BASED ON ALL HOUSEHOLDS)

	STRONGLY AGREE	AGREE	NEUTRAL (NEITHER)	DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE	NO OPINION	TOTAL WEIGHTED	RAW
BY CURRENT MARITAL STATUS:								
MARRIED	20.6	56.0	12.1	7.9	1.0	2.4	20027	3435
NOT MARRIED	26.6	57.1	8.5	4.3	0.6	2.8	4342	1171
BY RESPONDENTS EMPLOYMENT STATUS:								
EMPLOYED(FULL/PART)	21.1	58.2	9.9	7.7	0.8	2.3	8934	1761
NOT EMPLOYED	22.0	55.1	12.4	7.1	1.0	2.5	15375	2835
BY RACE/ETNICITY:								
WHITE	20.0	55.1	12.9	8.7	0.9	2.3	18312	2543
BLACK	28.0	59.2	5.9	3.7	1.0	2.3	3507	1408
SPANISH/OTHER	24.6	59.8	9.6	1.8	0.6	3.5	2571	657
BY POVERTY STATUS:								
BELOW POVERTY	30.2	57.6	6.1	3.2	0.9	2.0	3212	856
WITHIN 200% OF	23.0	57.5	11.0	4.9	1.1	2.4	5285	1189
ABOVE 200% OF POV.	19.0	57.4	12.2	9.2	0.9	1.4	13127	2036
ALL RESPONDENTS	21.7	56.5	11.4	7.3	0.9	2.3	24370	4609

UNCO

TABLE 3-49

REACTION TO THE STATEMENT:
"THE MAIN ADVANTAGE OF DAYCARE CENTERS IS THAT
CHILDREN LEARN TO GET ALONG WITH OTHERS."
(WEIGHTED PERCENTS BY MAIN METHOD OF CARE)

	STRONGLY AGREE	AGREE	NEUTRAL (NEITHER)	DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE	NO OPINION	TOTAL WEIGHTED	TOTAL RAW
IN HOME/RELATIVE	26.2	55.4	10.3	5.5	0.5	1.7	3418	633
IN HOME/NON-RELATIVE	16.3	56.5	13.6	10.9	0.5	1.8	3176	450
IN RELATIVE'S HOME	22.6	59.6	8.8	6.5	0.5	1.6	4136	841
IN NON-RELATIVES HOME	20.8	54.8	11.7	8.8	2.5	1.4	2513	441
NURSERY SCHOOL	36.5	47.0	9.1	3.7	0.6	3.0	874	180
DAYCARE CENTER	23.7	64.1	4.9	5.2	0.0	2.1	550	120
BEFORE/AFTER SCHOOL	13.5	59.7	18.2	5.9	0.5	2.2	308	56
HEADSTART	49.3	40.4	0.0	0.0	5.1	5.2	71	22
OTHER METHOD	20.8	48.1	17.8	13.3	0.0	0.0	591	55
NO MAIN METHOD	20.2	56.0	12.5	6.8	0.7	3.8	8754	1771
ALL RESPONDENTS	21.7	56.2	11.5	7.3	0.5	2.4	24350	4609

UNCC

TABLE 3-50

REACTION TO THE STATEMENT: "THERE IS TOO MUCH STRESS PLACED ON TRYING TO TEACH A CHILD THINGS IN MOST PLACES WHERE CHILDREN ARE TAKEN CARE OF." (WEIGHTED PERCENTS BASED ON ALL HOUSEHOLDS)

	STRONGLY		NEUTRAL		STRONGLY	NO	TOTAL	
	AGREE	AGREE	(NEITHER)	DISAGREE	DISAGREE	OPINION	WEIGHTED	RAW
BY CURRENT MARITAL STATUS:								
MARRIED	5.0	16.9	29.1	37.5	6.3	5.2	20027	3435
NOT MARRIED	6.5	20.4	25.4	37.9	6.2	3.7	4342	1171
BY RESPONDENTS EMPLOYMENT STATUS:								
EMPLOYED(FULL/PART)	4.2	17.4	26.7	39.2	7.5	5.0	6934	1761
NOT EMPLOYED	5.8	17.7	29.5	36.6	5.6	4.9	15375	2835
BY RACE/ETNICITY:								
WHITE	4.9	16.7	30.2	37.2	6.4	4.6	18312	2543
BLACK	7.5	19.7	22.5	38.3	8.1	3.9	3507	1408
SPANISH/OTHER	4.3	20.2	24.1	39.0	3.3	9.1	2571	657
BY POVERTY STATUS:								
BELOW POVERTY	9.2	19.0	22.5	37.9	4.1	7.2	3212	856
WITHIN 200% OF	5.3	20.4	27.6	36.1	5.6	5.0	5285	1189
ABOVE 200% OF POV.	4.5	15.8	29.6	40.1	6.8	3.3	13127	2036
ALL RESPONDENTS	5.3	17.5	28.3	37.8	6.3	4.8	24390	4609

UNCO

TABLE 3-51

REACTION TO THE STATEMENT:
"THERE IS TOO MUCH STRESS PLACED ON TRYING TO TEACH A CHILD THINGS
IN MOST PLACES WHERE CHILDREN ARE TAKEN CARE OF."
(WEIGHTED PERCENTS BY MAIN METHOD OF CARE)

	STRONGLY AGREE	AGREE	NEUTRAL (NEITHER)	DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE	NO OPINION	TOTAL WEIGHTED	RAW
IN HOME/RELATIVE	5.9	20.8	26.7	35.9	6.6	4.1	3418	633
IN HOME/NON-RELATIVE	3.8	15.0	34.0	35.6	7.6	4.0	3176	450
IN RELATIVE'S HOME	5.6	18.6	29.9	36.5	5.9	3.4	4136	841
IN NON-RELATIVES HOME	5.9	17.2	27.1	38.9	7.1	3.9	2513	441
NURSERY SCHOOL	2.3	13.8	16.9	46.8	15.6	4.6	874	180
DAYCARE CENTER	3.9	12.2	26.3	45.3	7.7	4.6	550	120
BEFORE/AFTER SCHOOL	2.7	13.2	40.1	39.1	2.7	2.2	308	56
HEADSTART	7.6	12.7	15.3	58.1	3.1	3.2	71	22
OTHER METHOD	3.7	20.8	32.8	35.8	5.0	1.9	591	55
NO MAIN METHOD	5.7	17.4	27.4	37.5	4.8	7.1	8754	1771
ALL RESPONDENTS	5.2	17.5	28.4	37.6	6.3	4.9	24390	4609

UACC

TABLE 3-52

REACTION TO THE STATEMENT: "DAYCARE CENTERS OFTEN HAVE TOO WIDE A RANGE OF AGES TO DO A GOOD JOB CARING FOR ALL OF THEIR CHILDREN."

(WEIGHTED PERCENTS BASED ON ALL HOUSEHOLDS)

	STRONGLY AGREE	AGREE	NEUTRAL (NEITHER)	DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE	NO OPINION	TOTAL WEIGHTED	RAW
BY CURRENT MARITAL STATUS:								
MARRIED	4.0	17.5	41.5	26.4	2.6	7.9	20027	3435
NOT MARRIED	3.9	18.3	35.2	29.6	5.1	7.9	4342	[illegible]
BY RESPONDENTS EMPLOYMENT STATUS:								
EMPLOYED(FULL/PART)	3.4	14.8	38.9	31.7	4.2	6.9	8934	1761
NOT EMPLOYED	4.4	19.4	41.3	24.1	2.3	8.5	15375	2835
BY RACE/ETNICITY:								
WHITE	4.1	16.5	43.6	25.7	2.3	7.9	18312	2543
BLACK	4.4	21.7	28.0	33.3	6.4	6.2	3507	1408
SPANISH/OTHER	3.1	20.7	34.6	27.4	3.7	10.6	2571	657
BY POVERTY STATUS:								
BELOW POVERTY	5.4	17.9	35.0	28.6	4.8	8.4	3212	856
WITHIN 200% OF	3.0	19.7	37.0	27.3	2.8	10.2	5285	1189
ABOVE 200% OF POV.	4.3	15.8	43.9	27.4	3.0	5.6	13127	2036
ALL RESPONDENTS	4.0	17.5	40.5	27.1	3.1	7.7	24390	4609

UNCO

TABLE 3-53

REACTION TO THE STATEMENT:
"DAYCARE CENTERS OFTEN HAVE TOO WIDE A RANGE OF AGES TO DO A GOOD JOB CARING FOR ALL OF THEIR CHILDREN."
(WEIGHTED PERCENTS BY MAIN METHOD OF CARE)

	STRONGLY AGREE	AGREE	NEUTRAL (NEITHER)	DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE	NO OPINION	TOTAL WEIGHTED	RAW
IN HOME/RELATIVE	3.2	15.8	46.9	24.8	1.9	7.4	3418	633
IN HOME/NON-RELATIVE	3.8	19.8	45.4	20.3	3.3	7.4	3176	450
IN RELATIVE'S HOME	4.1	17.0	41.4	27.8	3.2	6.5	4136	841
IN NON-RELATIVES HOME	2.9	14.7	40.3	30.4	5.4	6.4	2513	441
NURSERY SCHOOL	3.3	21.0	21.8	42.2	7.6	4.2	874	180
DAYCARE CENTER	4.2	14.1	23.4	45.6	10.5	2.3	550	120
BEFORE/AFTER SCHOOL	1.0	12.1	37.3	43.0	2.2	4.4	308	56
HEADSTART	3.4	23.7	12.0	53.5	0.0	7.3	71	22
OTHER METHOD	4.1	22.8	46.7	24.0	0.0	2.4	551	95
NO MAIN METHOD	4.8	18.5	38.5	25.5	2.0	10.6	8754	1771
ALL RESPONDENTS	4.0	17.7	40.4	26.9	3.0	7.9	24350	4609

UNCC

TABLE 3-54

REACTION TO THE STATEMENT: "I DON'T THINK THAT CHILDREN GET ENOUGH PERSONAL ATTENTION AT DAYCARE CENTERS." (WEIGHTED PERCENTS BASED ON ALL HOUSEHOLDS)

	STRONGLY AGREE	AGREE	NEUTRAL (NEITHER)	DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE	NO OPINION	TOTAL WEIGHTED	RAW
BY CURRENT MARITAL STATUS:								
MARRIED	4.3	20.5	39.5	27.2	2.3	6.2	20027	3435
NOT MARRIED	4.6	22.2	35.8	29.5	2.4	5.5	4342	1171
BY RESPONDENTS EMPLOYMENT STATUS:								
EMPLOYED(FULL/PART)	4.1	20.3	35.7	31.6	2.6	5.6	8934	1761
NOT EMPLOYED	4.4	21.1	40.6	25.4	2.2	6.3	15375	2835
BY RACE/ETNICITY:								
WHITE	4.3	21.1	40.6	25.9	2.2	6.0	18312	2543
BLACK	5.2	19.8	32.3	33.7	3.7	5.2	3507	1408
SPANISH/OTHER	3.2	20.1	35.0	31.7	1.7	8.2	2571	657
BY POVERTY STATUS:								
BELOW POVERTY	6.2	17.8	34.2	32.9	2.2	6.7	3212	856
WITHIN 200% OF	4.2	21.0	36.8	29.1	1.9	6.8	5285	1189
ABOVE 200% OF POV.	3.8	21.4	40.5	27.4	2.3	4.6	13127	2036
ALL RESPONDENTS	4.3	20.8	38.8	27.9	2.3	5.9	24390	4609

UNCO

TABLE 3-55

REACTION TO THE STATEMENT:
"I DON'T THINK THAT CHILDREN GET ENOUGH PERSONAL
ATTENTION AT DAYCARE CENTERS."
(WEIGHTED PERCENTS BY MAIN METHOD OF CARE)

	STRONGLY AGREE	AGREE	NEUTRAL (NEITHER)	DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE	NO OPINION	TOTAL WEIGHTED	TOTAL RAW
IN HOME/RELATIVE	3.0	20.7	40.5	28.4	2.0	5.4	3418	633
IN HOME/NON-RELATIVE	5.2	27.3	40.0	19.1	1.7	6.6	3176	450
IN RELATIVE'S HOME	3.9	19.4	41.0	29.7	2.5	3.4	4136	841
IN NON-RELATIVES HOME	4.4	23.6	38.3	25.6	3.9	4.2	2513	441
NURSERY SCHOOL	2.3	17.3	19.2	51.4	6.7	3.0	874	180
DAYCARE CENTER	2.0	19.2	20.6	51.5	4.6	2.1	550	120
BEFORE/AFTER SCHOOL	3.3	7.2	45.4	31.7	3.1	9.2	308	56
HEADSTART	3.4	7.2	35.7	42.5	5.1	6.1	71	22
OTHER METHOD	3.6	28.0	41.3	24.2	1.6	1.3	591	55
NO MAIN METHOD	5.0	18.8	39.6	26.2	1.6	8.8	8754	1771
ALL RESPONDENTS	4.3	20.8	38.8	27.7	2.3	6.1	24390	4609

UNCC

TABLE 3-56

REACTION TO THE STATEMENT:
"I WOULD WORRY ABOUT MY CHILD GETTING FED PROPERLY IN PLACES WHERE GROUPS OF CHILDREN ARE TAKEN CARE OF."
(WEIGHTED PERCENTS BASED ON ALL HOUSEHOLDS)

	STRONGLY AGREE	AGREE	NEUTRAL (NEITHER)	DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE	NO OPINION	TOTAL	
							WEIGHTED	RAW
BY CURRENT MARITAL STATUS:								
MARRIED	5.1	23.4	18.7	46.2	4.4	2.2	20027	3435
NOT MARRIED	8.6	28.0	16.8	39.3	4.9	2.5	4342	1171
BY RESPONDENTS EMPLOYMENT STATUS:								
EMPLOYED(FULL/PART)	4.1	21.5	16.7	50.2	5.1	2.4	8934	1761
NOT EMPLOYED	6.6	25.9	19.4	41.8	4.1	2.1	15375	2835
BY RACE/ETNICITY:								
WHITE	4.8	22.2	19.8	47.3	3.8	2.2	18312	2543
BLACK	10.0	33.1	12.5	37.2	5.5	1.7	3507	1408
SPANISH/OTHER	6.7	26.6	16.8	38.4	7.7	3.7	2571	657
BY POVERTY STATUS:								
BELOW POVERTY	10.3	26.8	15.9	40.3	5.0	1.7	3212	856
WITHIN 200% OF	5.9	26.2	19.1	42.9	3.8	2.2	5285	1189
ABOVE 200% OF POV.	4.1	21.9	18.9	49.0	4.5	1.5	13127	2036
ALL RESPONDENTS	5.7	24.1	18.4	45.2	4.5	2.1	24390	4609

UNCO

TABLE 3-57

REACTION TO THE STATEMENT:
"I WOULD WORRY ABOUT MY CHILD GETTING FED PROPERLY IN PLACES WHERE
GROUPS OF CHILDREN ARE TAKEN CARE OF."
(WEIGHTED PERCENTS BY MAIN METHOD OF CARE)

	STRONGLY AGREE	AGREE	NEUTRAL (NEITHER)	DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE	NO OPINION	TOTAL WEIGHTED	TOTAL RAW
IN HOME/RELATIVE	7.1	27.4	22.7	38.8	2.6	1.4	3418	633
IN HOME/NON-RELATIVE	3.6	22.0	20.5	47.7	3.5	2.7	3176	450
IN RELATIVE'S HOME	6.1	27.6	19.7	42.2	2.8	1.4	4136	841
IN NON-RELATIVES HOME	4.4	21.1	19.6	46.5	6.6	1.7	2513	441
NURSERY SCHOOL	5.7	14.3	12.2	53.9	10.7	3.3	874	180
DAYCARE CENTER	4.5	15.3	14.0	50.5	11.2	4.6	550	120
BEFORE/AFTER SCHOOL	1.6	21.7	19.7	51.2	5.8	0.0	308	56
HEADSTART	26.1	31.4	1.8	36.0	4.7	0.0	71	22
OTHER METHOD	5.0	20.9	28.9	40.8	4.4	0.0	591	95
NO MAIN METHOD	6.3	24.8	15.3	45.9	4.7	3.0	8754	1771
ALL RESPONDENTS	5.7	24.2	18.4	44.9	4.5	2.2	24390	4609

LACC

TABLE 3-58

REACTION TO THE STATEMENT:
"DAYCARE CENTERS SHOULD ACCEPT INFANTS."
(WEIGHTED PERCENTS BASED ON ALL HOUSEHOLDS)

	STRONGLY AGREE	AGREE	NEUTRAL (NEITHER)	DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE	NO OPINION	TOTAL WEIGHTED	RAW
BY CURRENT MARITAL STATUS:								
MARRIED	10.2	26.1	23.4	27.9	8.4	4.0	20027	3435
NOT MARRIED	14.2	26.0	22.0	24.8	8.4	4.6	4342	1171
BY RESPONDENTS EMPLOYMENT STATUS:								
EMPLOYED(FULL/PART)	12.9	26.5	25.2	23.9	7.0	4.4	8934	1761
NOT EMPLOYED	9.7	25.8	21.9	29.4	9.1	4.0	15375	2835
BY RACE/ETNICITY:								
WHITE	9.8	25.7	24.5	27.4	8.6	4.0	18312	2543
BLACK	15.7	26.3	18.2	27.8	8.0	4.0	3507	1408
SPANISH/OTHER	12.1	28.7	20.3	26.4	6.9	5.6	2571	657
BY POVERTY STATUS:								
BELOW POVERTY	13.4	25.5	21.4	27.1	7.8	4.9	3212	856
WITHIN 200% OF	9.4	26.8	22.1	28.1	8.9	4.7	5285	1189
ABOVE 200% OF POV.	10.6	26.6	24.6	27.0	8.5	2.7	13127	2036
ALL RESPONDENTS	10.9	26.2	23.2	27.3	8.4	4.0	24390	4609

UNCO

TABLE 3-59

REACTION TO THE STATEMENT:
"DAYCARE CENTERS SHOULD ACCEPT INFANTS."
(WEIGHTED PERCENTS BY MAIN METHOD OF CARE)

	STRONGLY AGREE	AGREE	NEUTRAL (NEITHER)	DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE	NO OPINION	TOTAL WEIGHTED	TOTAL RAW
IN HOME/RELATIVE	11.8	23.3	22.8	32.5	7.3	2.2	3418	633
IN HOME/NON-RELATIVE	9.2	27.3	21.3	29.8	7.7	4.7	3176	450
IN RELATIVE'S HOME	10.5	22.6	24.5	29.4	9.5	3.5	4136	841
IN NON-RELATIVES HOME	13.5	26.7	25.3	22.5	8.5	3.0	2513	441
NURSERY SCHOOL	12.7	31.3	17.2	22.2	13.6	3.0	874	180
DAYCARE CENTER	11.7	22.1	15.2	42.5	2.6	6.0	550	120
BEFORE/AFTER SCHOOL	2.6	38.3	17.5	27.5	6.5	7.6	308	56
HEADSTART	9.2	29.0	20.8	6.5	20.8	13.8	71	22
OTHER METHOD	15.4	27.5	22.4	27.5	6.0	1.2	591	95
NO MAIN METHOD	10.3	27.4	24.0	24.5	8.3	5.4	8754	1771
ALL RESPONDENTS	10.9	26.1	23.1	27.3	8.4	4.2	24390	4609

UACC

IV. Selection, Change and Discontinuance

Section IV

FACTORS INFLUENCING SELECTION, CHANGE AND DISCONTINUANCE

Discussion

Both preferential opinions and stated reasons for selecting various forms of care must be treated cautiously as true measures of population tendencies. First, attitudes often lack concreteness, particularly when questions are interpreted as hypothetical by some or all of the respondents. Second, some of the issues necessarily confronted in analyzing child care selection factors tend to imply highly casuistic positions about the welfare of children which no one would oppose per se. Whether or not such factors are actually dominant in consumer decision-making, however, is more difficult to determine.

For example, virtually everyone would agree that the safety of children is important. That children will be safe from extraordinary exposure to hazard may, however, be presumed of any reputable caregiver. Thus, even though a respondent may give "safety" as the most important factor in selecting care, cost may still be the pivotal issue in deciding between arrangements.

Illustrating this point ad absurdum, if we wished to buy a car, it would be more important that the vehicle have a gas tank than, say, air conditioning. Yet as long as some cars do not come equipped with air conditioning, it is a little specious to make much of a point of the fact that the existence of a gas tank is more important than whether air conditioning is provided.

Similarly, some limit can be placed on almost any "selection factor." For example, some users might not consider cost to be very important. But there is a limit (let us say $1,000 per week to avoid controversy) past which virtually no one would use an arrangement for care.

Past Experience and Change

In an attempt to de-emphasize the hypothetical, manifest behavior in continuing to use given arrangements for care and, conversely, reasons for changing can be construed to measure tendencies toward stability and to indicate the magnitude of various consumer problems. Respondents using child care were asked how many times they had changed their "main methods" during the past year. About one in ten had changed with 2.4% having changed more than once.

Significantly, over half (54%) gave as their reason for changing (Table 4-1) either some problem with the arrangement (e.g., transportation, inconvenience, discipline, program, facilities, staff or special problems) as opposed to cost (10.5%), aging of the child (6.5%), moving from the area (8.1%) or changing employment status on the part of the respondent (18.0%). The modal reason was availability (18.7%). Given that over 60% of those who had changed identified their old method as one of the home-based types of care (Table 4-2), it is possible that some (but not all) respondents interpreted the question to refer to changing the person who provided care as opposed to the generic type or method of care.

These data represent only changes in arrangements and do not represent reasons for discontinuing care on the whole. The usage history of the entire sample sheds more light on this issue. All respondents (i.e., users and nonusers) were asked if they had used care in the past which they were not using at the time of the interviews. Just under half (47%) reported having discontinued at least one method.

TABLE 4-1

REASONS FOR CHANGING FROM MOST RECENT TYPE OF CARE*

Reason	Projected Households*	Percent
1. Too expensive	166	10.5
2. Did not like location	15	0.9
3. Transportation problems	56	3.5
4. Inconvenient hours	99	6.3
5. Child too young	38	2.4
6. Child not toilet trained	8	0.5
7. Waiting list	11	0.7
8. Child not accepted	0	0
9. Too little discipline	139	8.8
10. Lack of educational program	59	3.7
11. Lack of activities program	33	2.1
12. Lack of trained staff	27	1.7
13. Did not like provider	154	9.7
14. Did not like facilities	66	4.3
15. No reliable provider	72	4.5
16. Child has special problem	39	2.5
17. I stopped working	211	13.4
18. I started working	72	4.6
19. Child too old	103	6.5
20. Program out of existence	36	2.2
21. I moved	128	8.1
22 Provider no longer available	295	18.7
23. Other	230	14.6
TOTAL	1,578	100.0

*Totals do not add to 100%
due to multiple responses

TABLE 4-2

TYPE OF CARE FROM WHICH USERS MOST RECENTLY CHANGED

Type of Care	Projected Households*	Percent
1. In own home by relative (not spouse or child's brother or sister)	110	6.9
2. In own home by non-relative	198	12.5
3. In other home by relative	199	12.6
4. In other home by non-relative	473	30.0
5. In nursery school or pre-school	267	16.9
6. In a daycare center	168	10.6
7. In a cooperative program or babysitting cooperative	4	0.3
8. Before or after school activities program (not regular school hours)	11	0.7
9. Headstart	0	0.0
10. Other (including care by family members)	149	9.3
TOTAL	1,578	100.0

**Reported in thousands*

These respondents were asked up to four previously applicable methods together with the respective main reason for stopping (Table 4-3). Unlike most of the tables in this report, tabulations of this item include methods of care provided in an intra-household setting (e.g., by spouse or sibling) or through schools. The distribution of reasons for stopping shows a more "normal" pattern of termination (i.e., fewer problems and less contention), with "child too young," "I stopped working" and "I moved" assuming greater prominence among the reasons given. Yet there is ample evidence despite the small cell sizes to infer that a good deal of flux and discontinuance is caused by dissatisfaction with providers or their programs, and difficulties in making or maintaining arrangements.

It is much easier to identify response patterns when fewer cells are presented for analysis. Therefore, Table 4-4 was constructed using the following collapsed categories:

Category	Reasons Included
1. Cost	- too expensive
2. Ineligibility/ age of child	- child too young - child not toilet trained - waiting list - child not accepted - child too old (outgrew arrangement)
3. Location/ convenience	- did not like location - inconvenient hours
4. Program attributes	- too little discipline, supervision - lack of educational program - lack of program of activities - lack of trained staff
5. Change in parents work status	- I stopped working - I started working

TABLE 4-3

TYPES OF CARE PREVIOUSLY USED BY REASON FOR DISCONTINUING

Reason	Type of Care															
	Own Home By Rel		Own Home By Non-Rel		Other Home By Rel		Other Home By Non-Rel		Nursery/ Pre-school		Day Care Center		Cooperative Program		B/A School Program	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
1. Too expensive	38	1.7	176	6.5	1	0.0	74	3.1	169	4.9	89	6.8	2	0.5	19	6.7
2. Did not like location	0	0.0	0	0.0	13	0.6	3	0.1	3	0.1	12	0.9	0	0.0	0	0.0
3. Transportation problems	111	5.1	33	1.2	112	5.0	58	2.4	53	1.6	20	1.5	1	0.2	9	3.4
4. Inconvenient hours	17	0.8	32	1.2	62	2.8	39	1.6	22	0.7	12	0.9	0	0.0	0	0.0
5. Child too young	13	0.6	10	0.4	15	0.7	12	0.5	56	1.6	5	0.4	0	0.0	0	0.0
6. Child not toilet trained	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	3	0.1	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
7. Waiting list	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	4	0.3	3	0.7	0	0.0
8. Child not accepted	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	4	0.1	11	0.6	5	1.4	0	0.0
9. Too little discipline	33	1.5	66	2.4	7	0.3	52	2.2	31	0.9	57	4.4	11	3.1	11	4.0
10. Lack of educational program	24	0.1	10	0.4	11	0.5	26	1.1	14	0.4	15	1.1	0	0.0	0	0.0
11. Lack of activities program	6	0.3	21	0.8	2	0.1	7	0.3	3	0.1	4	0.3	0	0.0	17	6.1
12. Lack of trained staff	0	0.0	11	0.4	0	0.0	9	0.4	23	0.7	18	1.4	7	1.9	0	0.0
13. Did not like provider	9	0.4	114	4.2	7	0.3	129	5.4	50	1.5	43	3.3	4	1.2	0	0.0
14. Did not like facilities	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	13	0.5	80	2.3	53	4.1	13	3.7	19	7.0
15. No reliable provider	14	0.6	143	5.3	18	0.8	41	1.7	11	0.3	8	0.6	0	0.0	0	0.0
15. Child has special problem	0	0.0	1	0.0	13	0.6	26	1.1	10	0.3	20	1.5	6	1.7	6	2.1
17. I stopped working	188	8.6	280	10.3	230	10.2	421	17.6	261	7.6	293	22.4	2	0.6	10	3.6
18. I started working	0	0.0	18	0.7	6	0.3	19	0.8	17	0.5	0	0.0	11	3.3	0	0.0
19. Child too old	594	27.1	977	36.1	510	22.6	652	27.2	2,182	63.7	399	30.5	153	43.6	28	10.0
20. Program out of existence	26	1.2	57	2.1	53	2.4	39	1.6	66	1.9	24	1.9	38	10.9	70	25.4
21. I moved	252	11.0	135	5.0	360	16.0	187	7.8	140	4.1	130	9.9	57	16.4	22	8.1
22. Provider no longer available	531	24.2	162	6.0	363	16.1	221	9.2	57	1.7	19	1.5	22	6.4	25	9.1
23. Other	369	16.8	451	17.0	473	20.9	371	15.5	174	5.1	74	5.6	15	4.4	40	14.6
TOTAL	2,193	100.0	2,707	100.0	2,256	100.0	2,400	100.0	3,428	100.0	1,309	100.0	350	100.0	275	100.0

TABLE 4-3 (cont'd)

	TYPE OF CARE													
Reason	Headstart		Own Home By Spouse		Own Home By Older Sibling		By Self		Cares For Younger Sibling		Public or Private School		By Parent At Work	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
1. Too expensive	2	0.3	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	22	3.9	0	0.0
2. Did not like location	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	0.1	0	0.0
3. Transportation problems	6	0.9	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
4. Inconvenient hours	0	0.0	40	6.8	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
5. Child too young	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	15	28.4	0	0.0	5	1.0	9	9.7
6. Child not toilet trained	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
7. Waiting list	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
8. Child not accepted	9	1.3	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
9. Too little discipline	0	0.0	20	3.4	2	0.5	11	21.3	6	19.4	0	0.0	0	0.0
10. Lack of educational program	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
11. Lack of activities program	4	0.6	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
12. Lack of trained staff	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
13. Did not like provider	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
14. Did not like facilities	6	1.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	12	2.1	0	0.0
15. No reliable provider	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
16. Child has special problem	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
17. I stopped working	3	0.4	47	7.9	63	20.2	17	31.1	0	0.0	17	3.1	28	29.1
18. I started working	0	0.0	10	1.6	3	0.8	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
19. Child too old	541	80.5	114	19.2	100	32.0	6	11.5	23	72.2	422	76.4	22	23.5
20. Program out of existence	42	6.2	6	1.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	8	1.5	15	16.3
21. I moved	20	2.9	4	0.7	5	1.5	0	0.0	0	0.0	18	3.2	0	0.0
22. Provider no longer available	19	2.8	189	31.8	95	30.4	0	0.0	0	0.0	17	3.2	0	0.0
23. Other	20	3.0	164	27.7	46	14.6	4	7.7	3	8.3	30	5.5	20	21.3
TOTAL	672	100.0	594	100.0	313	100.0	53	100.0	32	100.0	552	100.0	95	100.0

TABLE 4-4

Types of Care Previously Used by Summary Reasons for Discontinuing

Reason	Own Home By Relative Number	Own Home By Relative Percent	Own Home By Non-relative Number	Own Home By Non-relative Percent	Other Home By Relative Number	Other Home By Relative Percent	Other Home By Non-relative Number	Other Home By Non-relative Percent	Nursery Pre-school Number	Nursery Pre-school Percent	Day Care Center Number	Day Care Center Percent
Cost	38	1.7	176	6.5	1	0.0	74	3.1	169	4.9	89	6.8
Ineligibility/age of child	607	27.7	987	36.5	525	23.3	667	27.8	2,242	65.4	419	32.0
Location/convenience	17	0.8	32	1.2	76	3.4	42	1.7	25	0.8	24	1.8
Program attributes	63	1.9	108	4.0	20	0.9	94	4.0	71	2.1	94	7.2
Change in parents' work status	188	8.6	298	11.0	236	10.5	440	18.4	278	8.1	293	22.4
Suitability of provider	580	26.4	476	17.6	438	19.6	443	18.4	264	7.7	147	11.4
Transportation problems	111	5.1	33	1.2	112	5.0	58	2.4	53	1.6	20	1.5
Other	621	27.8	597	22.0	846	37.5	584	24.4	324	9.5	224	17.0
Total	2,193	100.0	2,707	100.0	2,256	100.0	2,400	100.0	3,428	100.0	1,309	100.0

Category	Reasons included
6. Suitability of provider:	- did not like child care provider - did not like facilities - couldn't find a reliable child care provider - program out of existence - provider no longer available
7. Transportation problems:	- transportation problems
8. Other:	- child has special problems or needs - I moved - other

Cost is seldom the most important reason for discontinuing care. Only in the cases of non-relative babysitters and day care centers does the frequency of "high cost" exceed 5% of the reasons given.

Difficulties in identifying and maintaining suitable, available providers constitute the major causes of extraordinary (i. e., not due to child's age, change in work status, moving, etc.) discontinuance. Sixteen percent of those discontinuing methods of care cite reasons of this type. Although the proportions indicating difficulties in maintaining suitable providers are somewhat lower among historical nursery school and day care center users, it should be remembered that these methods are linked most strongly to the children's ages.

The single most common reported change was from care in non-relatives' homes (e.g., Family Day Care Homes) to in-home care by non-relatives (Table 4-5). Overall, 37% of current users who had used other methods in the past changed from care in non-relatives' homes to some other form of care. This group represents about 2.5% of the entire sample or nearly 600,000 households.

TABLE 4-5

Last Methods Used By Current Users

Main Method	In Own Home Relative	In Own Home Non-relative	In Other Home Relative	In Other Home Non-relative	Nursery School	Day Care Center	Other Methods	All Current	
In own home:									
By relative	87 4.3	256 12.5	434 21.2	428 20.9	317 15.5	522 25.5	0 0.0	2,044 100.0	12,9%
By non-relative	658 17.3	244 6.4	314 8.3	1,727 45.5	564 14.9	272 7.2	18 0.0	3,797 100.0	24.0
In other home:									
By relative	69 2.1	264 8.2	350 10.8	1,393 43.2	881 27.3	271 8.4	0 0.0	3,228 100.0	20.4
By non-relative	123 4.6	609 22.8	270 10.1	783 29.3	494 18.5	392 14.7	0 0.0	2,671 100.0	16.9
Nursery school	0 0.0	151 10.5	221 15.4	466 32.4	240 16.7	333 23.2	26 1.8	1,437 100.0	9.1
Day care center	116 5.8	390 19.4	343 17.1	765 38.1	213 10.6	182 9.1	0 0.0	2,009 100.0	12.7
Other methods	0 0.0	132 21.7	0 0.0	250 41.1	79 13.0	67 11.0	81 13.3	609 100.0	3.9
Total:									
Number	1,053	2,046	1,932	5,812	2,788	2,039	125	15,795	100.0
Percent	6.7	13.0	12.2	36.8	17.7	12.9	0.8	100.0	

Alternative Methods Considered

Insight into the way in which consumers select a method of care is perhaps best gleaned from a questionnaire panel asking from a historical perspective, what arrangements current users actually did consider. First, users of the principal methods were asked if they considered any other method, and three quarters reported that they had not. It is unclear, from a behavioral viewpoint, what constituted "consideration," but it is probable that for the 25.7% who had considered other methods, genuine decision-making had not been arbitrarily or circumstantially precluded.

Those who had considered other methods were then asked to name up to four methods considered and the respective "main reason" why they did not use each method. Cross-tabulated results of this question are presented on successive pages as Table 4-6 and include multiple responses.

While small cell sizes presage caution in drawing inferences from this table, several patterns are very clear. Foremost, nursery schools and day care centers were the most frequently chosen. Third in frequency was "own home by a non-relative," thus verifying very satisfactorily the distribution of preferred methods given in Section III.

In all three instances, cost is an important barrier, constituting the modal cells for nursery schools and centers and a very strong second factor for in-home care by a non-relative.

Once again it is somewhat difficult to interpret the results of a table having so many entries in the response taxonomy. Thus Table 4-7 is provided as a summary abridged version of Table 4-6 using the same compressed set of reasons defined above (cf., pg. 4-5).

Nursery schools and day care centers were each "considered" about three times more frequently than were Family Day Care Homes. The most

TABLE 4-6

TYPES OF CARE PREVIOUSLY CONSIDERED BEFORE SELECTING CURRENT ARRANGEMENTS BY REASON FOR NOT CHOOSING

Reason	Type of Care															
	Own Home By Rel		Own Home By Non-Rel		Other Home By Rel		Other Home By Non-Rel		Nursery/ Pre-school		Day Care Center		Cooperative Program		B/A School Program	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
1. Too expensive	5	2.1	190	24.8	5	2.0	60	12.2	447	33.0	320	25.5	43	15.3	13	9.1
2. Did not like location	8	3.0	8	1.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	23	2.1	35	2.8	14	4.8	0	0.0
3. Transportation problems	35	13.3	19	2.5	51	18.7	31	6.4	75	5.7	24	1.9	10	3.7	3	2.0
4. Inconvenient hours	9	3.2	7	0.9	34	12.4	12	2.4	54	4.1	40	3.1	19	6.7	13	8.9
5. Child too young	3	1.1	14	1.8	3	1.2	6	1.1	188	19.3	115	9.1	0	0.0	15	9.9
6. Child not toilet trained	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	39	3.0	5	0.4	0	0.0	9	6.3
7. Waiting list	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	0.4	31	2.3	52	4.1	0	0.0	1	0.4
8. Child not accepted	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	11	0.8	19	1.5	5	1.7	0	0.0
9. Too little discipline	12	4.4	26	3.5	1	0.4	23	4.8	2	0.2	50	4.0	0	0.0	4	2.8
10. Lack educational program	0	0.0	26	3.4	0	0.0	23	4.6	0	0.0	30	2.4	15	5.3	3	2.0
11. Lack of activities program	6	2.2	2	0.2	0	0.0	0	0.0	13	1.0	11	0.8	8	3.0	6	4.2
12. Lack of trained staff	0	0.0	14	1.8	0	0.0	5	1.0	19	1.4	0	0.0	0	0.0	4	2.9
13. Did not like provider	0	0.0	35	4.5	3	1.1	76	15.4	12	0.9	12	1.0	0	0.0	6	4.0
14. Did not like facilities	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	22	4.6	46	3.5	38	3.0	3	0.9	0	0.0
15. No reliable provider	3	1.2	227	29.7	10	3.7	52	10.5	36	2.8	48	3.8	21	7.4	15	10.0
16. Child has special problem	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	7	1.3	21	1.6	11	0.9	0	0.0	0	0.0
17. I stopped working	4	1.7	30	3.9	2	0.6	30	6.1	56	4.2	62	5.0	0	0.0	13	8.9
18. I started working	3	1.2	2	0.2	2	0.9	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
19. Child too old	3	1.1	19	2.5	11	3.9	14	2.9	127	9.7	79	6.3	15	5.3	3	1.8
20. Program out of existence	0	0.0	10	1.2	0	0.0	7	1.3	14	1.0	42	3.3	38	13.6	0	0.0
21. I moved	5	1.8	7	0.9	13	4.6	5	1.1	0	0.0	36	2.9	0	0.0	0	0.0
22. Provider no longer available	84	31.5	37	4.8	58	21.4	44	9.0	8	0.6	6	0.5	0	0.0	2	1.6
23. Other	85	32.2	94	12.3	79	29.2	73	14.8	90	6.8	221	17.6	90	32.2	37	25.2
TOTAL	265	100.0	765	100.0	271	100.0	490	100.0	1,315	100.0	1,255	100.0	280	100.0	147	100.0

TABLE 4-6 (cont'd)

Reason	Type of Care													
	Headstart		Own Home By Spouse		Own Home By Older Sibling		By Self		Cares For Younger Sibling		Public or Private School		By Parent At Work	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
1. Too expensive	13	7.8	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	34	38.6	0	0.0
2. Did not like location	4	2.1	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
3. Transportation problems	14	8.3	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	18	20.7	0	0.0
4. Inconvenient hours	12	7.2	10	13.4	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
5. Child too young	15	8.6	2	3.2	14	32.1	8	40.3	6	32.4	13	14.8	0	0.0
6. Child not toilet trained	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
7. Waiting list	10	6.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
8. Child not accepted	6	3.5	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
9. Too little discipline	0	0.0	15	20.2	11	25.1	0	0.0	9	48.9	0	0.0	0	0.0
10. Lack educational program	4	2.1	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
11. Lack of activities program	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
12. Lack of trained staff	4	2.5	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
13. Did not like provider	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
14. Did not like facilities	4	2.5	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	3.2	5	5.5	0	0.0
15. No reliable provider	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
16. Child has special problem	0	0.0	0	0.0	3	6.9	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
17. I stopped working	2	1.4	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	3	100.0
18. I started working	0	0.0	1	1.3	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
19. Child too old	20	11.5	0	0.0	10	23.4	0	0.0	0	0.0	13	15.2	0	0.0
20. Program out of existence	6	3.3	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
21. I moved	11	6.6	4	5.8	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
22. Provider no longer available	7	3.8	21	27.5	2	5.2	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
23. Other	39	23.0	21	28.5	3	7.5	12	59.7	3	14.8	5	5.5	0	0.0
TOTAL	170	100.0	74	100.0	43	100.0	21	100.0	18	100.0	87	100.0	3	100.0

TABLE 4-7

Types of Care Previously Considered Before Selecting Current Arrangements By Reason For Not Choosing

Reason For Not Choosing	Type of Care Considered											
	Own Home By Relative		Own Home By Non-relative		Other Home By Relative		Other Home By Non-relative		Nursery Pre-school		Day Care Center	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Cost	5	2.1	190	24.8	5	2.0	60	12.2	447	33.0	320	25.5
Ineligibility/age of child	6	2.2	33	4.3	14	5.1	22	4.4	396	35.1	270	21.4
Location/convenience	17	6.2	15	1.9	34	12.4	12	2.4	82	6.2	75	5.9
Program attributes	18	6.6	68	8.9	1	0.4	51	10.4	34	2.6	91	7.2
Change in parents' work status	7	2.9	32	4.1	4	1.5	30	6.1	56	4.2	62	5.0
Suitability of provider	87	32.7	309	40.2	71	26.2	161	40.8	116	8.8	146	11.6
Transportation problems	35	13.3	19	2.5	51	18.7	31	6.4	75	5.7	24	1.9
Other	90	34.0	101	13.2	92	33.8	85	17.2	101	8.4	268	21.4
Total	265	100.0	765	100.0	271	100.0	490	100.0	1,315	100.0	1,255	100.0

prominent barriers in selecting center or nursery school care were high cost and difficulties in locating programs in which the respondents could enroll their children. In contrast, those who "considered" Family Day Care Homes were more likely to reject that form of care because of program attributes or problems in locating suitable providers.

There is no doubt some overlap between the constructed categories "ineligibility/age of child" and "suitability of provider," especially as defined above. But these data must still be interpreted to mean that Family Day Care Home programs do not appeal to a substantial group of consumers irrespective of cost or convenience factors.

Selection Factors

Current users of in-home care, nursery schools or day care centers and family day care homes were asked to choose, in rank order of importance, seven factors in selecting their child care arrangement. Tables 4-8, 4-9 and 4-10 present the results from these questions expressed as percentages of the elibible response. An additional column, labeled "weighted rank," was calculated by multiplying the value 7 by the proportion ranked first, 6 by the proportion ranked second and so forth, finally using unity as the multiplicand for the proportion of observations ranked seventh.

For in-home as well as family day care users, the "reliability" and "warmth" of the caregiver were deemed, in the aggregate, to be the most important factors followed closely by the child's level of satisfaction. Although "availability" is relatively prominent, the responses indicate a very strong pattern of child-orientation from a common sense as opposed to procedural viewpoint. Such issues as licensure, health examinations for staff, qualifications and convenience are not highly ranked. Yet it is only fair to point out that users of these two methods of care are more likely to be casual users than, say, day care center users.

TABLE 4-8

RANK-ORDERED FACTORS FOR SELECTING A DAY CARE CENTER OR NURSERY SCHOOL

Factor	Rank Order							Weighted Rank
	1st	2nd	3rd	4th	5th	6th	7th	
1. Constant supervision	5.9	5.1	0.8	3.1	2.0	2.3	1.9	101
2. Help in school-related topics	1.7	3.6	4.3	4.1	3.9	2.9	2.6	92
3. Available when I need it	6.1	1.3	0.9	1.0	3.0	2.0	1.7	67
4. Frequent information about my child	1.0	5.6	3.0	7.7	10.8	8.4	7.9	143
5. Things are clean and safe	4.7	8.0	12.2	7.3	6.1	6.7	5.7	210
6. Reasonable cost	3.4	2.3	2.8	3.7	1.4	4.8	8.0	88
7. Fed right things at right times	0.5	1.8	3.2	3.8	4.0	2.3	4.4	67
8. Warm and loving caregiver	16.2	6.9	5.6	2.4	3.5	2.9	4.1	213
9. Discipline given when needed	2.0	2.9	4.4	5.0	8.1	8.6	4.7	120
10. Naps at proper times	0.9	0.8	2.0	0.8	2.6	3.1	1.2	40
11. Experienced caregiver	6.8	7.9	3.1	3.1	4.5	4.7	2.7	136
12. Cares for more than one of mine	1.3	1.2	1.1	1.0	1.2	1.3	1.6	34
13. Personal attention for my child	1.9	4.8	10.0	3.5	3.5	2.7	1.6	124
14. Has my views on childrearing	0.7	0.7	4.2	1.7	0.2	0.1	1.0	39
15. Child likes this type of care	14.5	9.3	3.4	3.3	1.3	4.9	3.1	204
16. Child learns to behave well	3.3	6.8	4.7	3.0	7.4	5.1	4.6	136
17. Building and Equipment are suitable	2.6	3.3	4.6	4.7	4.2	5.1	6.2	109
18. Planned and supervised group play	2.7	6.3	7.2	11.4	8.2	8.1	7.5	187
19. Well trained staff	16.8	9.2	9.6	7.2	7.4	5.1	2.1	204
20. Location is convenient	2.7	1.3	1.9	2.2	2.3	3.0	2.5	80
21. All have periodic health exams	0.4	0.9	2.8	1.3	1.9	4.6	3.1	31
22. Transportation provided	0.7	2.2	0.7	0.6	0.4	0.2	4.1	30
23. Parent involvement in program	1.0	1.5	0.6	1.8	2.0	0.7	4.8	38
24. Special services are available	0.7	3.6	0.8	2.3	0.4	1.9	1.7	32
25. Others from similar background	0.5	0.0	0.4	0.6	0.1	0.8	0.6	10
26. Not too many children for staff	0.8	1.2	3.3	7.9	6.9	4.6	3.2	94
27. Parents can get basic education	0.0	0.3	0.1	2.7	0.0	0.9	0.7	16
28. Others are in right age range	1.0	0.8	2.4	2.6	1.8	1.8	4.5	48
29. Place or caregiver recommended	0.1	0.5	0.1	0.1	0.8	0.4	1.1	9
TOTAL PERCENT	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	
PROJECTED HOUSEHOLDS	2,230							

Reported in thousands

TABLE 4-9

RANK-ORDERED FACTORS FOR SELECTING A CAREGIVER FOR IN-HOME CARE

Factor	Rank Order							Weighted Rank
	1st	2nd	3rd	4th	5th	6th	7th	
1. Constant supervision	5.3	5.2	5.3	4.7	3.5	2.8	1.6	131
2. Help in school-related topics	0.2	0.2	0.3	0.9	0.6	1.7	1.2	14
3. Available when I need it	3.9	3.5	3.2	3.8	3.7	5.9	5.4	108
4. Frequent information about my child	0.6	2.5	2.3	3.4	4.3	5.3	4.1	72
5. Things are clean and safe	3.9	6.1	7.1	7.3	7.1	7.5	4.6	170
6. Regular health exams for staff	1.3	0.6	1.1	0.3	1.1	0.9	1.6	26
7. Reasonable cost	3.2	2.0	3.0	2.0	2.6	3.4	11.4	83
8. Fed right things at right times	1.8	2.1	2.9	6.0	7.1	5.9	4.2	101
9. Warm and loving caregiver	14.5	11.3	10.5	8.0	6.4	3.5	3.7	284
10. Discipline given when needed	2.6	6.1	7.9	9.3	10.4	8.9	7.2	188
11. Naps at proper times	0.2	1.2	1.3	1.3	3.1	3.5	3.2	40
12. Experienced caregiver	7.1	7.4	7.0	5.2	5.6	4.2	3.2	178
13. Cares for more than one of mine	1.2	1.1	2.3	1.9	2.9	2.9	3.9	53
14. Personal attention for my child	1.3	2.4	3.7	4.9	3.5	3.2	2.1	81
15. Has my views on childrearing	1.4	1.6	1.9	2.7	1.8	2.5	2.7	53
16. Child likes this type of care	9.8	8.7	7.3	6.3	4.8	5.0	5.8	213
17. Child learns to behave well	0.7	0.7	1.2	2.3	1.6	3.3	2.4	36
18. Caregiver helps around house	0.1	0.4	0.3	0.5	0.5	1.1	1.0	17
19. Caregiver is a parent	0.5	0.2	0.7	0.9	0.4	0.8	0.6	15
20. Caregiver is a relative	3.4	1.9	1.4	1.0	1.8	1.6	3.3	58
21. I know caregiver well	5.9	4.6	4.0	4.6	4.9	4.1	3.3	134
22. Caregiver takes only my child	0.5	0.8	1.8	1.6	2.5	1.9	2.4	69
23. Is available for emergencies	2.8	3.2	2.9	2.9	3.1	3.1	3.4	84
24. Caregiver was recommended to me	0.7	0.8	0.7	0.9	0.4	0.8	0.9	21
25. Deals with child's special needs	1.2	1.6	1.8	2.0	1.7	2.6	1.2	47
26. Still can work when child's ill	0.3	0.8	1.0	1.0	0.7	1.0	1.2	21
27. Child is in own home and own bed	1.7	2.3	4.0	3.9	4.2	3.6	5.8	87
28. Child isn't taken elsewhere	1.6	1.9	2.2	2.6	3.2	4.8	3.4	67
29. Reliable and dependable caregiver	21.6	18.3	10.6	7.7	5.5	3.9	4.3	373
30. Too young for center or nursery	0.6	0.6	0.1	0.2	0.9	0.4	0.8	13
TOTAL PERCENT	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	
PROJECTED HOUSEHOLDS*	9,079							

*Reported in thousands

TABLE 4-10

RANK-ORDERED FACTORS FOR SELECTING A FAMILY DAY CARE HOME

Factor	Rank Order							Weighted Rank
	1st	2nd	3rd	4th	5th	6th	7th	
1. Constant supervision	5.8	4.1	4.1	4.5	3.4	2.1	2.5	125
2. Help in school-related topics	0.2	0.[illegible]	0.8	0.9	1.7	1.5	1.1	22
3. Available when I need it	5.4	3.4	3.2	2.9	4.1	3.8	5.6	111
4. Frequent information about my child	1.5	2.3	2.5	4.3	3.7	4.6	5.9	81
5. Things are clean and safe	5.2	10.0	11.8	11.6	8.1	6.9	4.3	244
6. Regular health exams for staff	1.6	1.2	1.3	1.1	1.7	1.3	1.8	39
7. Reasonable cost	4.5	2.9	4.5	3.4	3.4	3.8	8.9	112
8. Fed right things at right times	3.1	3.8	5.8	6.1	5.3	5.5	4.7	130
9. Warm and loving caregiver	13.7	10.7	7.9	7.7	5.9	4.3	2.6	259
10. Discipline given when needed	2.0	6.0	8.4	8.7	9.2	9.3	6.1	179
11. Naps at proper times	0.6	1.9	1.5	1.3	3.9	4.1	3.8	47
12. Experienced caregiver	6.3	7.0	5.7	4.8	4.3	2.8	2.7	155
13. Cares for more than one of mine	0.9	1.5	1.9	1.9	2.4	2.4	1.9	46
14. Personal attention for my child	1.7	2.9	2.9	2.6	2.4	3.7	1.8	71
15. Has my views on childrearing	2.7	3.4	2.5	1.6	2.7	2.6	2.1	71
16. Child likes this type of care	11.0	7.8	5.6	5.7	5.2	5.3	5.0	206
17. Child learns to behave well	0.5	1.4	1.9	2.3	3.0	3.3	3.6	50
18. Planned and supervised group play	0.3	0.9	2.2	3.2	3.5	3.9	1.8	51
19. Licensed family daycare mother	4.5	1.4	0.9	1.4	1.5	1.2	1.0	58
20. Home and equipment are suitable	2.0	2.0	3.2	3.4	3.1	4.0	3.9	77
21. Not too many other children	0.6	1.1	1.5	1.7	2.6	2.4	3.5	41
22. Others are in right age range	0.2	0.7	1.4	1.7	2.5	2.6	3.6	36
23. Location is convenient	2.2	2.7	3.7	2.9	3.1	5.5	6.8	89
24. Caregiver was recommended to me	0.4	0.4	0.3	0.3	0.6	0.8	0.8	10
25. Is available for emergencies	0.3	0.3	0.8	0.9	1.5	0.7	0.8	18
26. Others from similar background	0.2	0.6	0.2	0.6	0.7	0.9	1.2	14
27. Parent involvement is frequent	0.7	0.7	1.1	0.8	1.4	1.8	2.4	28
28. Still can work when child's ill	0.5	0.7	0.8	1.0	1.0	1.3	1.8	23
29. Home-like atmosphere	3.3	4.3	3.9	4.3	4.0	3.7	3.7	109
30. Child too young	0.6	0.5	0.4	0.1	0.4	0.5	0.7	13
31. Reliable and dependable caregiver	17.4	12.8	7.6	6.5	3.8	3.3	3.3	284
TOTAL PERCENT	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	
PROJECTED HOUSEHOLDS*	9,974							

*Reported in thousands

The taxonomies for each method of care referenced are different, as are the patterns of usage. Yet it can be said that center and nursery school users are somewhat more likely to identify programmatic and procedural factors (e.g., "frequent information," "planned and supervised play") than are home-care users. The differences between methods are, however, neither imminently clear nor strong.

These tables, involving up to 31 reasons (the taxonomies vary slightly due to the nature of the care) across seven rankings, are admittedly a little bit inscrutable. As an aid to interpretation, Table 4-11 was constructed using the following summary categorizations:

Category	Reasons within
Cost	- reasonable cost
Adult convenience	- available when I need it - cares for more than one of mine - location is convenient - transportation provided - caregiver helps around the house - is available for emergencies - still can work when child's ill
Child development	- constant supervision - help in school-related topics - things are clean and safe - fed right things at right times - discipline given when needed - naps at proper times - experienced caregiver - personal attention for my child - has my views on childrearing - child likes this type of care - child learns to behave well - building and equipment are suitable - planned and supervised group play - well trained staff - all have periodic health exams

Category	Reasons within
Child development (cont'd)	- special services are available
	- others from similar background
	- not too many children for staff
	- others in right age group
	- regular health exams for staff
	- warm and loving care
	- caregiver takes only my child
	- deals with child's special needs
	- child is in own home and own bed
	- child isn't taken elsewhere
	- reliable and dependable caregiver
	- licensed family day care mother
	- home and equipment are suitable
	- not too many other children (in FDCH)
	- home-like atmosphere
Other	- frequent information about my child
	- parent involvement in program
	- parents can get basic education
	- place or caregiver recommended
	- caregiver is a parent
	- caregiver is a relative
	- I know caregiver well
	- too young for center or nursery
	- parent involvement is frequent (in FDCH)
	- child too young

TABLE 4-11

Summary Factors For Selecting Types of Care
(First and Second Ranking Only)

Factor	Type of Care					
	Day Care Center/ Nursery School		In Home Care		Family Day Care Home	
	Rank Order					
	1st	2nd	1st	2nd	1st	2nd
Cost	3.4	2.3	3.2	2.0	4.5	2.9
Adult convenience	9.8	6.0	8.3	9.0	9.3	8.6
Child development	84.6	83.9	76.8	78.4	83.0	84.6
Other	2.1	7.8	11.7	10.6	3.2	3.9
Total percent	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

Considering only responses ranked first or second, and keeping in mind the problems discussed at the beginning of the chapter with respect to consumer opinion on child welfare issues, it is clear that most consumers at least purport to select care for child-oriented reasons over cost or convenience.

The child-developmental type reasons were reported to be slightly less important for in-home care, but this can be accounted for in part by differing criteria for very casual or occasional use.

Least Important Selection Factors

All users were asked to identify, from a list of five summary factors, the one which was least important to them. If the distribution is to be taken at face value, cost (31.6%) is the least important factor followed by convenience of location (28.5%), whether or not the caregiver or program "agrees with (parents') views on childrearing (20.7%), child development activities and instruction (9.8%) and, finally, convenience of hours available.

The structure of the response to this question is surprisingly stable across the various user groups (Table 4-12), levels of educational attainment (Table 4-13), employment statae (Table 4-14), and even income level (Table 4-15). But there are significant differences based on each of those variables.

The poor, those with lower levels of educational attainment and employed mothers generally discount the importance of concordance on childrearing views. In a comparative sense, these population subgroups are also less likely to give "child development" as the least important factor.

In contrast, upper income respondents tend to discount cost, as do those who are not employed. These differences are not very strong, however. Convenience of hours is particularly unlikely to be the least important factor

TABLE 4-12

Least Important Reason In Selecting A Child Care Arrangement By Current Method Used

Main Method	Cost	Convenience of Hours	Convenience of Location	Child Development	Agrees With Childrearing views	All Factors	Percent of Total
In own home:							
By relative	1,087 32.0	419 12.3	816 24.0	250 7.4	825 24.3	3,397 100.0	22.5
By non-relative	1,094 34.7	284 9.0	864 27.4	338 10.7	576 18.2	3,156 100.0	20.9
In other home:							
By relative	1,280 31.3	330 8.1	1,221 29.8	504 12.3	757 18.5	4,092 100.0	27.2
By non-relative	716 28.6	144 5.8	758 30.2	333 13.3	556 22.2	2,506 100.0	16.6
Nursery school	314 36.0	90 10.3	296 34.0	21 2.4	152 17.4	872 100.0	5.8
Day Care Center	141 26.7	41 7.8	171 32.5	22 4.1	152 28.9	527 100.0	3.5
Cooperative program	32 22.9	39 27.9	61 43.4	0 0.0	8 5.7	139 100.0	0.9
Before/after school program	76 24.7	43 14.0	115 37.3	11 3.5	63 20.5	308 100.0	2.0
Headstart	21 29.0	10 14.4	14 19.4	0 0.0	26 37.3	71 100.0	0.5
Total	4,760 31.6	1,401 9.3	4,315 28.6	1,478 9.8	3,115 20.7	15,068 100.0	100.0

TABLE 4-13

Least Important Reason In Selecting A Child Care Arrangement By Educational Attainment

Educational Attainment	Cost	Convenience of Hours	Convenience of Location	Child Development	Agrees With Childrearing views	All Factors	Percent of Total
Grades 1-8	202	45	130	82	119	577	3.7
	35.0	7.8	22.4	14.2	20.5	100.0	
Some high school	697	238	541	286	608	2,371	15.2
	29.4	10.1	22.8	12.1	25.6	100.0	
High school graduate	1,914	577	1,774	569	1,418	6,252	40.0
	30.6	9.2	28.4	9.1	22.7	100.0	
Some college	1,192	332	1,271	394	782	3,972	25.4
	30.0	8.4	32.0	9.9	19.7	100.0	
College graduate	934	256	748	206	322	2,466	15.8
	37.9	10.4	30.3	8.3	13.1	100.0	
Total	4,939	1,449	4,464	1,537	3,250	15,638	100.0
	31.6	9.3	28.5	9.8	20.8	100.0	

TABLE 4-14

Least Important Reason In Selecting A Child Care Arrangement By Income Status

Income Level	Cost	Convenience of Hours	Convenience of Location	Child Development	Agrees With Childrearing views	All Factors	Percent of Total
Below poverty	309 20.0	218 14.1	316 20.5	199 12.9	500 32.5	1,540 100.0	10.9
Within 200% of poverty	918 27.9	275 8.4	1,009 30.7	405 12.3	682 20.7	3,290 100.0	23.3
Above 200% of poverty	3,226 34.7	798 8.6	2,767 29.8	794 8.5	1,706 18.4	9,292 100.0	65.8
Total	4,453 31.5	1,291 9.1	4,092 29.8	1,398 9.9	2,889 20.5	14,123 100.0	100.0

TABLE 4-15

Least Important Reason In Selecting A Child Care Arrangement By Employment Status

Mother's Employment Status	Cost	Convenience of Hours	Convenience of Location	Child Development	Agrees With Childrearing views	All Factors	Percent of Total
Employed full-time	1,222	250	1,156	496	929	4,052	25.9
	30.2	6.2	28.5	12.2	22.9	100.0	
Employed part-time	713	138	733	211	479	2,274	14.5
	31.4	6.1	32.2	9.3	21.1	100.0	
Not employed	3,013	1,061	2,575	828	1,834	9.310	59.5
	32.4	11.4	27.7	8.9	19.7	100.0	
Total	4,948	1,449	4,464	1,534	3,242	15,636	100.0
	31.6	9.3	28.5	9.8	20.7	100.0	

among employed mothers and, consequently, those using the more formal methods of care.

Cost and Transportation Thresholds

As we conjectured at the beginning of this section, "factors" which are not necessarily rated highly are nevertheless subject to upper limits. Two such factors—cost and transportation—are relatively susceptible to measurement.

Current users were asked to estimate the maximum amount of money they "would be able to spend altogether for all of (their) child care needs on a weekly basis" in their "present situation." The results of this item are given in Table 4-16 by income level and the respondent's employment status.

The median cost threshold occurs within the cell $15 through $19 per week. Employed mothers, however, would (be able to) pay more, with an observed median between $20 and $24 per week. It is noteworthy, if only by coincidence, that this reported figure corresponds to the mean weekly cost paid for institutional care (i.e., day care centers) by mothers working full time.*

As one would suspect, households below poverty reported a much lower ability to pay. The observed median for poor respondents is between $6 and $9 per week with 85% of the cases giving maximum figures below $20 per week. Nearly one in three (30%) gave "none" as the "threshold."

While fewer households in the marginal income class (within 200% of poverty) reported an ability to pay nothing, (13.1%), the distribution is otherwise very similar to that for poor households. The median for this vulnerable group is between $10 and $14 per week. Less than one in three reported an ability to pay more than $20 per week.

---

*See Volume II, Section VIII.

TABLE 4-16

Maximum Ability to Pay For Child Care by Poverty and Employment Status
(Current Child Care Users in Thousands)

	Amount Per Week											
	None	$1-5	$6-9	$10-14	$15-19	$20-24	$25-29	$30-34	$35-39	Over $40	Total	Percent of Total
Poverty status:												
Below poverty	458	273	148	225	216	121	49	27	9	26	1,552	11.1
	29.5	17.6	9.6	14.5	13.9	7.8	3.2	1.7	0.6	1.7	100.0	
Within 200% of poverty	427	565	295	503	464	453	306	99	51	108	3,270	23.3
	13.1	17.3	9.0	15.4	14.2	13.8	9.3	3.0	1.6	3.3	100.0	
Above 200% of poverty	573	1,051	813	1,244	1,080	1,359	1,278	570	206	1,039	9,213	65.6
	6.2	11.4	8.8	13.5	11.7	14.8	13.9	6.2	2.2	11.3	100.0	
Employment status:												
Employed full-time	196	143	140	440	557	773	652	412	165	564	4,042	26.1
	4.9	3.5	3.5	10.9	13.8	19.1	16.1	10.2	4.1	14.0	100.0	
Employed part-time	218	203	209	372	357	311	300	58	30	199	2,256	14.6
	9.7	9.0	9.3	16.5	15.8	13.8	13.3	2.6	1.3	8.8	100.0	
Not employed	1,299	1,721	980	1,331	1,017	1,065	856	288	111	511	9,179	59.3
	14.1	18.7	10.7	14.5	11.1	11.6	9.3	3.1	1.2	5.6	100.0	
Total	1,713	2,067	1,329	2,142	1,931	2,149	1,809	758	306	1,274	15,478	100.0
	11.1	13.4	8.6	13.8	12.5	13.9	11.7	4.9	2.0	8.2	100.0	

With respect to transportation, the mean, mode and median thresholds are between ten and 19 minutes (Table 4-17). Eighty-five percent would not be willing to have their children travel as much as 30 minutes.

TABLE 4-17

Maximum Time Users Would Be Willing To
Have Children Travel to Child Care

Amount of Time	Projected Households	Percent
Less than 10 minutes	2,804	17.9
10-19 minutes	7,601	48.5
20-29 minutes	2,954	18.9
30-39 minutes	1,462	9.3
40 minutes or more	429	2.7
No time	412	2.6
TOTAL	15,662	100.0

**Reported in thousands*

V. Attitudes on Working Mothers

ATTITUDES ON WORKING MOTHERS

Employed Mothers: A Review

Because child care usage is so often job related, the employment status of mothers deserves special mention. Just over a third of the sample reported being employed at least part-time (Table 5-1) with nearly a quarter assuming full-time jobs. An additional 4% were not working but were in school or job training and about 5% were unemployed and seeking work.

TABLE 5-1

RESPONDENT'S EMPLOYMENT STATUS

Status	Projected Households*	Percent
Full-time	5,737	23.6
Part-time	3,196	13.1
Neither	15,375	63.3
TOTAL	24,309	100.0

**Reported in thousands*

Both the distribution of earned income (Table 5-2) and the distribution of job classifications (Table 5-3) for respondents paint woefully stereotypical portraits of the American woman. Only 1.2% of respondents (versus 17% of households) earn over $20,000 with nearly half (45% versus 9.6% for households) earning under $5,000, albeit true that about one-third of those employed work only part-time. But the majority are employed in service or clerical positions.

TABLE 5-2

ANNUAL EARNED INCOME OF WORKING RESPONDENTS

Income Class	Projected Households*	Percent
Under $2,000	1,006	12.8
$2,000-2,999	932	11.8
3,000-3,999	805	10.2
4,000-4,999	801	10.2
5,000-5,999	784	9.9
6,000-6,999	679	8.6
7,000-7,999	620	7.9
8,000-8,999	627	8.0
9,000-9,999	426	5.4
10,000-11,999	616	7.8
12,000-14,999	337	4.3
15,000-19,999	158	2.0
20,000 and up	92	1.2
TOTAL	7,884	100.0

*Reported in thousands

TABLE 5-3

JOB CLASSIFICATIONS OF WORKING RESPONDENTS

Job Classifications	Projected Households*	Percent
Professional, technical	1,703	19.4
Farmers, farm managers	0	0.0
Managers, officials, proprietors	499	5.7
Clerical	3,343	38.1
Sales workers	370	4.2
Craftsmen, foremen	151	1.7
Operatives	782	8.9
Private household workers	137	1.6
Service workers	1,630	18.6
Farm laborers and foremen	145	1.7
Non-farm laborers	7	0.1
TOTAL	8,767	100.0

**Reported in thousands*

In analyzing many of the attitude variables and in assessing child care usage experience it is worth noting that about half of those respondents not currently working have worked at some time since having children.

On the other hand, nine out of ten of the spouses (i.e., "husbands") are currently employed on a full-time basis. An estimated 6.4% are not employed, a figure roughly commensurate with the national unemployment rate.

Sixty percent of those who work reported that they did so "for economic survival" (Table 5-4). About half stated that they "like what (they) do on (their) job(s)."

Of the 62% who were not employed, more than half (53%) ventured, as a reason for not working, that they "can contribute more to (their) famil(ies) as homemaker(s)" (Table 5-5). About 8% said that, among other reasons, they did not work because they couldn't find, or couldn't afford, suitable child care arrangements. One in four felt that "(the) youngest child is too young to leave with someone else."

TABLE 5-4

REASONS FOR WORKING

Reason	Projected Households*	Percent
1. It is necessary for economic survival	5,289	60.1
2. To get a little bit more than the basic necessities	3,600	40.9
3. To buy the nicer things, luxuries, get ahead	2,312	26.3
4. I don't want to be on welfare	1,627	18.5
5. It gives me a feeling of independence and self-satisfaction	3,727	42.4
6. I like what I do on my job	4,357	49.5
7. To get out of the house and away from the children for a while	1,098	12.5
8. To have contact with other adults and their ideas	2,634	29.9
TOTAL	8,796	100.0

**Numbers in thousands; totals do not add to 100% due to multiple answers*

TABLE 5-5

REASONS FOR NOT WORKING

Reasons	Projected Households*	Percent
1. I am in school or job training	538	3.6
2. I can contribute more to my family as a homemaker	7,964	52.8
3. I'm not physically able to work	1,406	9.3
4. My youngest child is too young to leave with someone else	3,921	26.0
5. I'm too busy with other responsibilities to have the time to work	3,316	22.0
6. Taking care of my children is more creative and satisfying than taking a job	6,414	42.5
7. I don't need the money	1,832	12.1
8. I can't make enough money to make it worth my while to work	2,741	18.2
9. I just don't like to work	638	4.2
10. I can't find the kind of job I want	761	5.0
11. I don't have enough job skills	1,355	9.0
12. My spouse doesn't want me to work	4,835	32.1
13. I am the only one who should take care of my child	3,003	19.9
14. I can't find the kind of child care arrangements I would need to work	1,101	7.3
15. I can't afford the kind of child care arrangements I would need to work	1,145	7.6
16. I can't find a job, none available	769	5.1
17. I am presently looking for a job	803	5.3
18. None of the above	588	3.9
TOTAL	15,080	100.0

**Numbers in thousands; totals do not add to 100% due to multiple answers*

Attitudes

Three attitude items were included in the questionnaire to measure the current public opinion on the role of the breadwinning woman vis-a-vis her presumed responsibility as mother. These statements are listed as follows according to the approximate degree to which they may be interpreted as judgmental or condemning:*

Statement: "A mother who works misses the experience of seeing her children grow up." (Tables 5-6 and 5-7)

Comment: Sixty-three percent agreed, 25% disagreed, and 11% were "neutral." Employed mothers were less likely to agree at 45%, but the results still indicate that employment can be considered, by and large, to be a compromise against raising children. If only we had asked a parallel question on working fathers!

Statement: "Working mothers miss the best years of their children's lives." (Tables 5-8 and 5-9)

Comment: Over two thirds (69%) agreed and only 17% disagreed. That nearly one in four working mothers strongly agreed with the statement is powerful testimony to the observations of some women's advocacy groups that residual guilt, culturally imposed, is highly pervasive among working women who have contravened their supposed chosen roles as wives and mothers. Both child care users and upper income users were significantly less likely to agree. Still, only among day care center users did less than half agree.

---

*Detailed tabulations are supplied at the end of the chapter.

Statement: "Mothers who work neglect their children as a result." (Tables 5-10 and 5-11)

Comment: Depending upon how the word "neglect" is interpreted, strong agreement to this statement could be construed to border on rank extremism. Seven percent strongly agreed, 15% agreed, 19% were neutral, 45% disagreed and 13% strongly disagreed. That 13% of working mothers agreed is a bit puzzling since a purely literal interpretation would amount to virtual admission to child neglect. It is more probable that these respondents are expressing a very deep seated guilt rather than any dangerous or acute concept of "neglect." However these results are interpreted, the effect is nothing short of devastating as a public judgment on working women by women.

One further attitude item polled mothers on the issue of child care costs versus earned income:

Statement: "It just doesn't pay to work if you have to pay someone to take care of your children." (Tables 5-12 and 5-13)

Comment: Forty percent agreed and 36% disagreed. Of greater significance, 29% of employed mothers agreed. Users of low-cost or free care, as evidenced by care by relatives, were likely to agree, reinforcing the observation made earlier that relatives are chosen as caregivers largely for economic reasons. Finally, a clear majority (56%) of those below poverty agreed.

TABLE 5-6

REACTION TO THE STATEMENT:
"A MOTHER WHO WORKS MISSES THE EXPERIENCE OF SEEING HER CHILDREN GROW UP."
(WEIGHTED PERCENTS BASED ON ALL HOUSEHOLDS)

	STRONGLY AGREE	AGREE	NEUTRAL (NEITHER)	DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE	NO OPINION	TOTAL WEIGHTED	RAW
BY CURRENT MARITAL STATUS:								
MARRIED	27.2	35.6	10.8	20.6	4.0	1.8	20027	3435
NOT MARRIED	24.7	36.8	11.6	20.3	4.8	1.7	4342	1171
BY RESPONDENTS EMPLOYMENT STATUS:								
EMPLOYED(FULL/PART)	16.1	29.3	12.5	31.9	8.3	1.9	8934	1761
NOT EMPLOYED	32.9	39.6	10.0	14.1	1.7	1.7	15375	2835
BY RACE/ETNICITY:								
WHITE	27.6	35.6	10.9	19.9	4.3	1.7	18312	2543
BLACK	22.0	36.1	11.1	24.2	4.8	1.7	3507	1408
SPANISH/OTHER	27.3	37.5	10.5	20.1	2.2	2.4	2571	657
BY POVERTY STATUS:								
BELOW POVERTY	30.9	39.7	10.5	15.3	2.5	1.2	3212	856
WITHIN 200% OF	30.3	39.0	9.4	17.0	2.6	1.7	5285	1189
ABOVE 200% OF POV.	24.3	32.8	11.8	24.7	5.4	1.0	13127	2036
ALL RESPONDENTS	26.8	35.7	10.9	20.8	4.2	1.6	24390	4609

UNCO

TABLE 5-7

REACTION TO THE STATEMENT:
"A MOTHER WHO WORKS MISSES THE EXPERIENCE OF SEEING HER CHILDREN GROW UP."
(WEIGHTED PERCENTS BY MAIN METHOD OF CARE)

	STRONGLY AGREE	AGREE	NEUTRAL (NEITHER)	DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE	NO OPINION	TOTAL WEIGHTED	TOTAL RAW
IN HOME/RELATIVE	28.4	35.1	14.8	17.6	2.7	1.4	3418	633
IN HOME/NON-RELATIVE	23.6	35.3	13.7	22.2	3.1	2.2	3176	450
IN RELATIVE'S HOME	28.0	35.7	9.9	21.1	3.8	1.6	4136	841
IN NON-RELATIVES HOME	21.0	28.0	11.7	28.9	9.2	1.1	2513	441
NURSERY SCHOOL	16.5	30.2	10.4	28.0	12.0	3.0	874	180
DAYCARE CENTER	14.7	30.5	9.9	33.9	8.4	2.7	550	120
BEFORE/AFTER SCHOOL	19.1	41.4	20.0	17.8	1.7	0.0	308	56
HEADSTART	37.1	29.5	0.0	23.0	6.4	4.0	71	22
OTHER METHOD	18.1	50.7	14.4	14.2	2.7	0.0	591	95
NO MAIN METHOD	31.0	38.4	8.3	17.4	2.9	2.1	8754	1771
ALL RESPONDENTS	26.8	35.8	10.9	20.6	4.1	1.8	24390	4609

UACC

TABLE 5-8

REACTION TO THE STATEMENT: "WORKING MOTHERS MISS THE BEST YEARS OF THEIR CHILDREN'S LIVES." (WEIGHTED PERCENTS BASED ON ALL HOUSEHOLDS)

	STRONGLY AGREE	AGREE	NEUTRAL (NEITHER)	DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE	NO OPINION	TOTAL WEIGHTED	RAW
BY CURRENT MARITAL STATUS:								
MARRIED	34.8	32.9	13.3	14.9	2.3	1.7	20027	3435
NOT MARRIED	31.8	37.5	10.4	13.7	4.6	2.0	4342	1171
BY RESPONDENTS EMPLOYMENT STATUS:								
EMPLOYED(FULL/PART)	23.0	31.2	14.6	24.5	5.0	1.7	8934	1761
NOT EMPLOYED	40.8	35.2	11.9	9.0	1.4	1.8	15375	2835
BY RACE/ETNICITY:								
WHITE	35.5	31.9	13.8	14.6	2.5	1.7	18312	2543
BLACK	27.8	39.3	11.1	16.9	3.0	2.0	3507	1408
SPANISH/OTHER	34.9	39.4	8.0	11.5	3.9	2.3	2571	657
BY POVERTY STATUS:								
BELOW POVERTY	39.0	38.3	7.1	9.8	4.0	1.9	3212	856
WITHIN 200% OF	37.8	37.6	9.7	11.9	1.5	1.5	5285	1189
ABOVE 200% OF POV.	32.0	30.6	15.8	17.6	3.1	1.0	13127	2036
ALL RESPONDENTS	34.3	33.7	12.9	14.7	2.7	1.6	24390	4609

UNCO

TABLE 5-9

REACTION TO THE STATEMENT:
"WORKING MOTHERS MISS THE BEST YEARS OF THEIR CHILDREN'S LIVES."
(WEIGHTED PERCENTS BY MAIN METHOD OF CARE)

	STRONGLY AGREE	AGREE	NEUTRAL (NEITHER)	DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE	NO OPINION	TOTAL WEIGHTED	TOTAL RAW
IN HOME/RELATIVE	38.2	29.7	13.4	14.3	3.0	1.4	3418	633
IN HOME/NON-RELATIVE	31.9	32.8	16.9	14.9	2.0	1.6	3176	450
IN RELATIVE'S HOME	36.8	31.7	14.5	14.0	2.0	1.1	4136	841
IN NON-RELATIVES HOME	29.1	29.7	13.4	21.0	5.2	1.6	2513	441
NURSERY SCHOOL	24.4	27.2	16.7	18.6	10.0	3.0	874	180
DAYCARE CENTER	17.4	27.5	16.4	29.0	6.4	3.3	550	120
BEFORE/AFTER SCHOOL	17.1	43.5	18.0	21.3	0.0	0.0	308	56
HEADSTART	36.6	23.9	13.0	23.2	3.4	0.0	71	22
OTHER METHOD	36.5	38.8	11.4	12.5	0.8	0.0	591	95
NO MAIN METHOD	36.4	38.3	9.4	11.7	1.8	2.4	8754	1771
ALL RESPONDENTS	34.3	33.8	12.8	14.6	2.7	1.8	24350	4609

UNCC

TABLE 5-10

REACTION TO THE STATEMENT: "MOTHERS WHO WORK NEGLECT THEIR CHILDREN AS A RESULT." (WEIGHTED PERCENTS BASED ON ALL HOUSEHOLDS)

	STRONGLY		NEUTRAL		STRONGLY	NO	TOTAL	
	AGREE	AGREE	(NEITHER)	DISAGREE	DISAGREE	OPINION	WEIGHTED	RAW
BY CURRENT MARITAL STATUS:								
MARRIED	6.4	14.4	19.0	45.8	12.4	2.0	20027	3435
NOT MARRIED	7.3	17.2	19.5	37.9	16.1	2.1	4342	1171
BY RESPONDENTS EMPLOYMENT STATUS:								
EMPLOYED(FULL/PART)	2.6	10.1	13.4	49.1	23.1	1.7	8934	1761
NOT EMPLOYED	8.8	17.7	22.4	41.7	7.2	2.2	15375	2835
BY RACE/ETNICITY:								
WHITE	6.0	13.4	19.3	45.8	13.6	2.0	18312	2543
BLACK	6.9	19.8	17.2	41.7	12.5	2.0	3507	1408
SPANISH/OTHER	10.3	19.2	20.4	37.9	9.7	2.5	2571	657
BY POVERTY STATUS:								
BELOW POVERTY	11.4	20.3	22.7	35.1	8.6	1.7	3212	856
WITHIN 200% OF	7.1	21.5	19.8	39.7	9.7	2.1	5285	1189
ABOVE 200% OF POV.	5.1	10.3	16.9	50.3	16.2	1.1	13127	2036
ALL RESPONDENTS	6.6	14.8	19.0	44.6	13.1	1.9	24390	4609

TABLE 5-11

REACTION TO THE STATEMENT:
"MOTHERS WHO WORK NEGLECT THEIR CHILDREN AS A RESULT."
(WEIGHTED PERCENTS BY MAIN METHOD OF CARE)

	STRONGLY AGREE	AGREE	NEUTRAL (NEITHER)	DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE	NO OPINION	TOTAL WEIGHTED	TOTAL RAW
IN HOME/RELATIVE	5.5	12.5	20.7	46.2	13.7	1.4	3418	633
IN HOME/NON-RELATIVE	4.6	8.9	20.8	51.4	12.7	1.6	3176	450
IN RELATIVE'S HOME	5.1	16.4	20.3	44.2	12.8	1.2	4136	841
IN NON-RELATIVES HOME	2.9	10.1	16.2	45.2	24.2	1.3	2513	441
NURSERY SCHOOL	4.3	11.8	13.1	42.4	25.5	3.0	874	180
DAYCARE CENTER	1.0	6.5	10.9	51.7	25.4	4.6	550	120
BEFORE/AFTER SCHOOL	11.1	13.8	9.8	49.8	15.4	0.0	308	56
HEADSTART	3.0	25.6	29.5	24.7	12.6	4.7	71	22
OTHER METHOD	7.7	11.2	29.6	41.0	10.4	0.0	591	95
NO MAIN METHOD	9.9	19.8	18.7	40.8	7.8	3.0	8754	1771
ALL RESPONDENTS	6.6	14.9	19.1	44.4	13.0	2.0	24390	4609

UACC

TABLE 5-12

REACTION TO THE STATEMENT:
"IT JUST DOESN'T PAY TO WORK IF YOU HAVE TO PAY
SOMEONE TO TAKE CARE OF YOUR CHILDREN."
(WEIGHTED PERCENTS BASED ON ALL HOUSEHOLDS)

	STRONGLY AGREE	AGREE	NEUTRAL (NEITHER)	DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE	NO OPINION	TOTAL WEIGHTED	RAW
BY CURRENT MARITAL STATUS:								
MARRIED	12.8	27.5	21.5	32.7	3.3	2.3	20127	3435
NOT MARRIED	12.3	26.7	20.7	32.7	5.3	2.2	4342	1171
BY RESPONDENTS EMPLOYMENT STATUS:								
EMPLOYED(FULL/PART)	8.4	20.5	20.9	42.1	5.9	2.3	8934	1761
NOT EMPLOYED	15.2	31.4	21.5	27.3	2.4	2.2	15375	2835
BY RACE/ETNICITY:								
WHITE	12.3	27.1	22.2	32.6	3.5	2.3	18312	2543
BLACK	10.9	26.3	18.0	37.6	5.5	1.7	3507	1408
SPANISH/OTHER	18.0	31.6	19.4	26.1	2.2	2.7	2571	657
BY POVERTY STATUS:								
BELOW POVERTY	21.5	34.2	18.2	22.2	2.3	1.6	3212	856
WITHIN 200% OF	15.8	30.3	19.6	28.7	3.4	2.1	5285	1189
ABOVE 200% OF POV.	9.9	23.7	22.8	38.0	4.0	1.5	13127	2036
ALL RESPONDENTS	12.8	27.3	21.3	32.9	3.6	2.1	24390	4609

UNCO

TABLE 5-13

REACTION TO THE STATEMENT:
"IT JUST DOESN'T PAY TO WORK IF YOU HAVE TO PAY SOMEONE TO TAKE CARE OF YOUR CHILDREN."
(WEIGHTED PERCENTS BY MAIN METHOD OF CARE)

	STRONGLY AGREE	AGREE	NEUTRAL (NEITHER)	DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE	NO OPINION	TOTAL WEIGHTED	RAW
IN HOME/RELATIVE	11.7	27.7	26.0	30.4	2.3	1.9	3418	633
IN HOME/NON-RELATIVE	9.7	29.0	21.7	33.5	3.0	3.1	3176	450
IN RELATIVE'S HOME	11.3	23.9	22.1	37.0	4.1	1.6	4136	841
IN NON-RELATIVES HOME	8.5	18.0	22.9	42.7	6.3	1.5	2513	441
NURSERY SCHOOL	8.6	18.3	19.0	40.0	11.1	3.0	874	180
DAYCARE CENTER	3.5	27.4	19.8	37.1	7.7	4.6	550	120
BEFORE/AFTER SCHOOL	12.4	30.9	19.4	36.6	0.7	0.0	306	56
HEADSTART	29.1	23.2	22.9	21.6	3.1	0.0	71	22
OTHER METHOD	5.0	23.8	27.8	39.4	3.0	1.0	591	95
NO MAIN METHOD	17.4	32.2	18.4	26.8	2.6	2.7	8754	1771
ALL RESPONDENTS	12.7	27.4	21.3	32.7	3.6	2.3	24390	4609

UNCO

VI. The Public Role

Section VI

THE PUBLIC ROLE

On Government Involvement Generally

About one in six respondents believed that "the government should not be involved in programs to take care of children" (Table 6-1). Nearly two thirds, however, supported at least some form of government involvement, and the remaining one-fifth were undecided or neutral.

Although users of care were generally more likely to support government programs (Table 6-2), the differences between users and non-users are small enough to suggest that underlying political philosophies or cultural hereditaments are as important as either current need or circumstances in determining overall positions on the state role in child care. The same can be said of income level, race, employment status and marital status. That is, none of these variables are strongly predictive of the respondents' overall attitude toward government involvement in child care programs.

Yet there are significant and important differences between population subgroups. Blacks were the most likely to support a government role and were the least likely to express an undecided or neutral position. Single parent (i.e., "not married") respondents were also more likely to support a government role than were married mothers. Although there is basis to contend, as discussed above, that "marginal income" households (above poverty but within 200% of poverty level) may often need, but not receive, assistance,

TABLE 6-1

REACTION TO THE STATEMENT:
"THE GOVERNMENT SHOULD NOT BE INVOLVED IN PROGRAMS TO TAKE CARE OF CHILDREN."
(WEIGHTED PERCENTS BASED ON ALL HOUSEHOLDS)

	STRONGLY		NEUTRAL		STRONGLY	NO	TOTAL	
	AGREE	AGREE	(NEITHER)	DISAGREE	DISAGREE	OPINION	WEIGHTED	RAW
BY CURRENT MARITAL STATUS:								
MARRIED	6.5	10.3	18.1	48.4	13.9	2.7	20027	3435
NOT MARRIED	4.4	8.7	17.2	45.8	20.8	3.0	4342	1171
BY RESPONDENTS EMPLOYMENT STATUS:								
EMPLOYED(FULL/PART)	6.4	10.2	17.2	46.4	17.1	2.7	8934	1761
NOT EMPLOYED	6.1	10.0	18.5	48.6	14.0	2.8	15375	2835
BY RACE/ETNICITY:								
WHITE	6.9	10.5	19.7	46.4	13.8	2.7	18312	2543
BLACK	4.0	7.0	11.3	53.4	21.6	2.6	3507	1408
SPANISH/OTHER	3.6	10.8	14.7	51.4	15.9	3.6	2571	657
BY POVERTY STATUS:								
BELOW POVERTY	5.3	9.2	15.9	47.9	18.9	2.9	3212	856
WITHIN 200% OF	7.4	9.6	18.7	49.3	11.9	3.1	5285	1189
ABOVE 200% OF POV.	5.8	10.2	17.8	48.8	15.9	1.5	13127	2036
ALL RESPONDENTS	6.1	10.0	17.9	48.1	15.2	2.6	24390	4609

UNCO

TABLE 6-2

REACTION TO THE STATEMENT:
"THE GOVERNMENT SHOULD NOT BE INVOLVED IN PROGRAMS TO TAKE CARE OF CHILDREN."
(WEIGHTED PERCENTS BY MAIN METHOD OF CARE)

	STRONGLY AGREE	AGREE	NEUTRAL (NEITHER)	DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE	NO OPINION	TOTAL WEIGHTED	TOTAL RAW
IN HOME/RELATIVE	3.5	8.5	20.3	48.8	15.9	2.5	3418	633
IN HOME/NON-RELATIVE	5.2	9.2	21.1	46.9	14.8	2.9	3176	450
IN RELATIVE'S HOME	5.9	7.9	19.1	49.1	15.1	2.9	4136	841
IN NON-RELATIVES HOME	7.7	9.8	12.8	47.3	20.2	2.1	2513	441
NURSERY SCHOOL	5.8	7.5	6.1	45.9	31.6	3.0	874	180
DAYCARE CENTER	5.1	7.4	11.5	51.7	19.7	4.6	550	120
BEFORE/AFTER SCHOOL	8.1	18.1	30.7	37.7	4.4	1.0	308	56
HEADSTART	0.0	16.5	0.0	46.5	37.0	0.0	71	22
OTHER METHOD	3.3	7.4	20.7	53.7	10.6	4.3	591	95
NO MAIN METHOD	7.5	12.2	18.0	47.5	12.0	2.8	8754	1771
A L L RESPONDENTS	6.2	10.1	18.0	47.9	15.1	2.8	24390	4609

UNCO

they are the least likely to favor public intervention. Predictably, users of care in institutional settings (nursery schools and day care centers) tended to support a government presence.

Perhaps the most interesting observation to be made from Table 6-1, however, remains the similarity of the various groups, especially between working and non-working mothers.

As an extreme measure of position with respect to the government role, respondents were asked if "(they) would be willing to have (their) taxes raised in order to support child care activities" (Tables 6-3 and 6-4). Nearly a third indicated such a willingness, but 47% were unwilling. If the "neutral" category can be taken at face value, it is reasonable to speculate that about half of the U.S. households with children under 14 would not oppose, *pro forma*, increased program activities linked to a tax increase. About one in six might "strongly" oppose such a measure.

In general, the structure of the respective distributions is similar to those given in Tables 6-1 and 6-2. In other words, racial minorities, single parents, the poor, the employed and center/nursery school users are the most likely to favor tax-linked child care activities. The polarity exhibited by employed respondents is noteworthy, however, since they were simultaneously the most likely to "strongly agree" or "strongly disagree."

Comparing Tables 6-1 and 6-3, it can be inferred, more or less, that about 30% of the sample population opposed increased taxes although they did not strictly oppose government involvement in child care programs.

TABLE 6-3

REACTION TO THE STATEMENT:
"I WOULD BE WILLING TO HAVE MY TAXES RAISED IN ORDER TO SUPPORT
CHILDCARE ACTIVITIES."
(WEIGHTED PERCENTS BASED ON ALL HOUSEHOLDS)

	STRONGLY AGREE	AGREE	NEUTRAL (NEITHER)	DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE	NO OPINION	TOTAL WEIGHTED	TOTAL RAW
BY CURRENT MARITAL STATUS:								
MARRIED	3.7	25.5	19.4	31.4	17.6	2.5	20027	3435
NOT MARRIED	5.2	29.8	23.2	26.8	11.8	3.2	4342	1171
BY RESPONDENTS EMPLOYMENT STATUS:								
EMPLOYED(FULL/PART)	4.5	29.6	16.8	29.3	17.3	2.5	8934	1761
NOT EMPLOYED	3.7	24.3	22.0	31.4	16.0	2.6	15375	2835
BY RACE/ETNICITY:								
WHITE	3.8	25.4	20.2	30.8	17.3	2.4	18312	2543
BLACK	6.1	26.3	18.6	31.8	14.4	2.8	3507	1408
SPANISH/OTHER	2.1	31.8	21.0	27.5	13.8	3.8	2571	657
BY POVERTY STATUS:								
BELOW POVERTY	7.0	26.8	19.9	30.3	12.9	3.2	3212	856
WITHIN 200% OF	2.9	27.1	20.9	28.2	17.8	3.1	5285	1189
ABOVE 200% OF POV.	3.7	27.4	19.8	31.1	16.6	1.4	13127	2036
ALL RESPONDENTS	4.0	26.4	20.1	30.5	16.5	2.5	24390	4609

UNCO

TABLE 6-4

REACTION TO THE STATEMENT:
"I WOULD BE WILLING TO HAVE MY TAXES RAISED IN ORDER TO SUPPORT
CHILDCARE ACTIVITIES."
(WEIGHTED PERCENTS BY MAIN METHOD OF CARE)

	STRONGLY AGREE	AGREE	NEUTRAL (NEITHER)	DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE	NO OPINION	TOTAL WEIGHTED	TOTAL RAW
IN HOME/RELATIVE	4.0	28.1	21.6	28.2	16.2	1.8	3418	633
IN HOME/NON-RELATIVE	2.4	24.9	21.1	31.7	17.5	2.4	3176	450
IN RELATIVE'S HOME	3.6	26.5	21.6	31.0	14.7	2.5	4136	841
IN NON-RELATIVES HOME	5.2	25.6	21.8	25.3	19.9	2.2	2513	441
NURSERY SCHOOL	5.5	37.6	18.0	21.4	13.1	4.4	874	180
DAYCARE CENTER	12.0	43.0	12.9	19.1	8.4	4.6	550	120
BEFORE/AFTER SCHOOL	0.0	20.4	15.7	47.5	14.9	1.5	308	96
HEADSTART	6.9	20.6	29.4	30.6	7.2	5.2	71	22
OTHER METHOD	5.9	28.1	23.2	32.9	9.8	0.0	591	55
NO MAIN METHOD	3.6	23.9	18.4	33.4	17.6	3.1	8754	1771
ALL RESPONDENTS	4.0	26.2	20.1	30.6	16.5	2.6	24390	4609

UNCO

Funding Priorities

Whether or not respondents believed that the government should be involved, they were asked to chose one of two possible funding vehicles as follows:

TABLE 6-5

"(I am going to read you two ways that child care funds can be used.) Which one...would you most like to see used?"

Funding Mechanism	Percent
1) Direct cash payments to working parents for child care	19.5
2) Direct cash payments to the person or agency providing the child care for the parents	74.9
3) (NOT READ:) Neither	5.4
	100%

All but about 5% were able to make a choice when forced by the wording of the questionnaire. Presumably, those unable to make a choice could not support either mechanism for funding. The great majority (75%) preferred funding providers over making cash payments to users.

Those who would be most likely to receive cash payments were generally more likely to chose this method of funding (Table 6-6), particularly the poor and heads of single-parent households. Minority respondents, especially those of Spanish culture, were decidedly more likely to favor direct cash payments to users.

TABLE 6-6

OPINION ON WAYS TO SPEND CHILD CARE FUNDS WITH SPENDING PRESUPPOSED (ALL RESPONDENTS)

	Direct Cash Payments to Working Parents	Direct Cash Payments to Agency or Provider	Neither	Total	Number Weighted	Raw
By Current Marital Status:						
Married	18.1	75.9	5.8	100.0	20,027	3,435
Not Married	26.5	69.4	3.6	100.0	4,342	1,171
By Respondents Employment Status:						
Employed (Full/Part)	21.5	73.0	5.3	100.0	8,934	1,761
Not Employed	18.5	75.7	5.6	100.0	15,375	2,835
By Race/Ethnicity:						
White	17.5	75.9	6.3	100.0	18,312	2,543
Black	23.0	75.0	1.6	100.0	3,507	1,498
Spanish/Other	29.5	65.8	4.7	100.0	2,571	657
By Poverty Status:						
Below Poverty	26.9	70.6	2.5	100.0	3,212	856
Within 200% of	18.4	76.5	4.8	100.0	5,285	1,189
Above 200% of Poverty	17.6	76.4	5.9	100.0	13,127	2,036
All Respondents	19.5	74.9	5.4	100.0	24,390	4,609

While each of these observed differences can be considered important from the standpoint of statistical probability (i.e., significant at the 0.1 level), they are, once again, not overwhelmingly strong. Of particular note are the very similar distributions shown for those employed versus not employed.

A related questionnaire item proffered three general approaches to "handling" the costs of child care (Table 6-7).

TABLE 6-7

"...which one of these statements best describes your preference on the way to handle the costs of child care in general?"

Statement	Percent
1) Child care should be free for all those who might need it regardless of income	8.8
2) The costs of child care should be adjusted according to parents' ability to pay (sliding scale)	82.0
3) Parents should pay all costs of the child care they use	9.0
4) Unable to answer	.2
	100%

Paradoxically, fewer than one in ten felt that all parents should pay the full cost of services used despite the fact that 16% thought the government should not be involved in child care programs at all (cf., Table 6-1, supra). Here, two possible explanations may help interpretations. First, some respondents who are philosophically opposed to government intervention may have "cast their votes" in resignation for "the lesser of evils." Second, the question did not presuppose government funding, and it is thus probable that some envisioned a compensatory "sliding fee" system operating purely within the private sector.

About the same proportion of the survey population (8.8%) chose the option of making care free to all those who need it. Single parents, racial minorities and poor respondents were substantially more likely to chose this option (Tabie 6-8). Before concluding that 9% of mothers with children under 14 support universal free care, however, it should be pointed out that the response categories were not exhaustive. The most important option not listed might be free care for the poor and full payment for everyone else. To be sure, sliding scales can be interpreted to originate at zero, but this may have been misconstrued.

Under any interpretation of the data, it is clear that most respondents recognized some need for assistance to the poor. The sliding scale or adjusted cost philosophy can probably be considered politically palatable to perhaps four out of five mothers with children under 14.

If cash payments were made to users, at least 80% would prefer that they be made on the basis of financial need as shown in Tables 6-9 and 6-10. The statement presented in these tables involves a highly equivocal complex question (e.g., should payments be made, or if they were made should they be based on need or both?). Nevertheless, it is interesting that only about one in ten disagreed with the statement as written.

TABLE 6-8

PERCENT DISTRIBUTION OF OPINIONS AS TO HOW TO HANDLE COSTS OF CHILD CARE IN GENERAL

	Child Care Should Be Free to All, Regardless of Income	Costs Should be Adjusted on Slicing Scale Based on Need	Parents Should Pay all Costs of Child Care They Use	Total	Number	
					Weighted	Raw
By Current Marital Status:						
Married	7.7	81.7	10.3	100.0	20,027	3,435
Not Married	13.9	82.7	3.3	100.0	4,342	1,171
By Respondents Employment Status;						
Employed (Full/Part)	8.9	82.3	8.6	100.0	8,934	1,761
Not Employed	8.8	81.7	9.4	100.0	15,375	2,835
By Race/Ethnicity:						
White	6.1	83.0	10.6	100.0	18,312	2,543
Black	17.7	79.3	2.9	100.0	3,507	1,408
Spanish/Other	15.9	77.6	6.3	100.0	2,571	657
By Poverty Status:						
Below Poverty	17.1	77.9	4.9	100.0	3,212	856
Within 200% of	9.7	81.4	8.8	100.0	5,285	1,189
Above 200% of Poverty	6.2	83.8	9.8	100.0	13,127	2,036
All Respondents	8.8	82.0	9.0	100.0	24,390	4,609

TABLE 6-9

REACTION TO THE STATEMENT:
"CASH PAYMENTS FOR CHILDCARE TO WORKING MOTHERS SHOULD
BE BASED UPON THEIR FINANCIAL NEED."
(WEIGHTED PERCENTS BASED ON ALL HOUSEHOLDS)

	STRONGLY AGREE	AGREE	NEUTRAL (NEITHER)	DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE	NO OPINION	TOTAL WEIGHTED	TOTAL RAW
BY CURRENT MARITAL STATUS:								
MARRIED	23.5	56.6	6.8	8.8	2.6	1.7	20027	3435
NOT MARRIED	32.9	54.5	6.2	4.0	0.7	1.6	4342	1171
BY RESPONDENTS EMPLOYMENT STATUS:								
EMPLOYED(FULL/PART)	25.3	55.1	6.8	8.9	2.3	1.5	8934	1761
NOT EMPLOYED	25.1	56.9	6.6	7.4	2.3	1.7	15375	2835
BY RACE/ETNICITY:								
WHITE	23.0	57.8	6.9	8.1	2.5	1.6	18312	2543
BLACK	34.4	49.9	6.1	6.4	1.4	1.8	3507	1408
SPANISH/OTHER	27.6	54.0	6.1	8.7	1.6	1.9	2571	657
BY POVERTY STATUS:								
BELOW POVERTY	32.8	55.4	4.3	5.3	0.8	1.4	3212	856
WITHIN 200% OF	26.4	56.9	6.0	7.1	2.4	1.2	5285	1189
ABOVE 200% OF POV.	22.9	57.4	7.1	8.9	2.7	1.0	13127	2036
A L L RESPONDENTS	25.2	56.4	6.6	8.0	2.3	1.5	24390	4609

UNCO

TABLE 6-10

REACTION TO THE STATEMENT:
"CASH PAYMENTS FOR CHILDCARE TO WORKING MOTHERS SHOULD
BE BASED UPON THEIR FINANCIAL NEED."
(WEIGHTED PERCENTS BY MAIN METHOD OF CARE)

	STRONGLY AGREE	AGREE	NEUTRAL (NEITHER)	DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE	NO OPINION	TOTAL WEIGHTED	RAW
IN HOME/RELATIVE	26.9	58.4	4.9	7.1	1.4	1.3	3418	633
IN HOME/NON-RELATIVE	23.6	57.2	6.4	8.6	2.7	1.6	3176	450
IN RELATIVE'S HOME	21.8	55.3	6.6	8.6	2.4	1.3	4136	841
IN NON-RELATIVES HOME	30.5	52.3	7.6	6.6	1.8	1.1	2513	441
NURSERY SCHOOL	27.0	46.4	5.9	10.8	5.7	4.2	874	180
DAYCARE CENTER	30.0	61.2	4.0	1.0	1.1	2.6	550	120
BEFORE/AFTER SCHOOL	20.7	51.6	20.1	2.5	4.3	0.9	308	56
HEADSTART	49.7	50.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	71	22
OTHER METHOD	22.5	57.5	11.9	7.8	0.0	0.3	591	95
NO MAIN METHOD	24.7	55.6	6.7	8.6	2.4	2.1	8754	1771
ALL RESPONDENTS	25.2	56.3	6.7	8.0	2.3	1.7	24350	4609

UACC

Respondents were also asked to identify in rank order those program support options for which they would most like to see funds used from the following list:*

- A referral system where parents could get information about screened and qualified people and agencies to provide child care (62.1%).
- Assistance to establish additional child care facilities (49.9%).
- Summer programs (58.3%).
- Before and after school programs (47.8%).
- A monitoring system to check on caregivers and facilities (39.3%).
- Training programs for caregivers (52.2%).

Table 6-11 gives the percentage frequency distributions of the items ranked first, second and third, respectively. The column entitled "weighted rank" was obtained by arbitrarily assigning the value 3 to first rankings through 1 for third rankings, adding up all values and dividing by 3 (the number of rankings included). Percentages shown represent relative distributions of those giving rankings. Approximately 4% did not favor any of the options given.

---

*Percentages given indicate absolute proportions mentioning items regardless of ranking. Items are listed according to order on the questionnaire.

TABLE 6-11

Analysis of Program Option Rankings

Options	Percent Ranking			Weighted Rank
	1st	2nd	3rd	
Referral service	31.6	17.5	16.6	49
Summer programs	15.6	18.4	19.9	35
Training for caregivers	16.3	17.4	17.9	34
Assistance to establish new facilities	17.4	15.0	15.9	33
Before, after school programs	9.3	17.1	16.5	26
Monitoring system	9.7	14.4	13.1	24
Total	100%	100%	100%	
Projected response	23,234	21,041	16,062	

On Licensure

In response to the assertion, "I think everyone who takes care of children should be licensed," about one in four either agreed or strongly agreed (Table 6-12); but majorities of those with an opinion in all selected demographic subgroups disagreed. Clearly, respondents' perceptions of what was meant by "(taking) care of children" were influential in determining their positions. A plurality of those using day care centers (47%) agreed with the statement compared against only about one in eight of those whose main method was in-home by non-relative care. Non-users were more likely to think all providers should be licensed than were users.

Respondents using care in non-relatives' homes as their main methods were less likely than the population as a whole to support universal licensing. Nearly two-thirds of those with an opinion disagreed with the statement.

Throughout the data presented thus far in this chapter, the poor have shown a somewhat greater tendency to support government intervention generally. In this comparative framework, they are less likely to support universal licensing (Table 6-13).

The structure of these attitudes on licensure is confounded rather than clarified by the response distribution to a question asking opinions regarding qualifications for in-home non-related caregivers (Table 6-14).

TABLE 6-14

"Do you think there should be personal qualifications set for non-related people who care for children in the children's own home. In other words, should sitters be required to pass health exams, educational requirements or meet some other kind of standard if they were providing care in your home?"

Response	Percent
Yes	45.0
No	49.5
Don't know	5.5
	100.0

TABLE 6-12

REACTION TO THE STATEMENT:
"I THINK EVERYONE WHO TAKES CARE OF CHILDREN SHOULD BE LICENSED."
(WEIGHTED PERCENTS BY MAIN METHOD OF CARE)

	STRONGLY AGREE	AGREE	NEUTRAL (NEITHER)	DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE	NO OPINION	TOTAL WEIGHTED	RAW
IN HOME/RELATIVE	7.3	13.0	16.3	52.1	8.6	2.6	3418	633
IN HOME/NON-RELATIVE	5.0	7.7	11.6	64.0	9.7	2.0	3176	450
IN RELATIVE'S HOME	5.3	12.4	17.3	53.4	9.8	1.9	4136	841
IN NON-RELATIVES HOME	8.7	10.9	15.3	53.0	10.0	2.1	2513	441
NURSERY SCHOOL	19.4	15.2	15.7	39.2	6.4	4.2	874	180
DAYCARE CENTER	20.4	26.7	17.8	30.4	2.4	2.3	550	120
BEFORE/AFTER SCHOOL	7.3	26.5	16.3	43.4	5.6	0.9	308	56
HEADSTART	4.2	5.5	17.8	69.1	3.4	0.0	71	22
OTHER METHOD	11.2	18.7	9.0	56.3	4.8	0.0	591	95
NO MAIN METHOD	15.1	18.8	16.8	40.8	5.3	3.1	8754	1771
ALL RESPONDENTS	10.4	14.8	15.8	49.0	7.6	2.5	24390	4609

UACC

TABLE 6-13

REACTION TO THE STATEMENT:
"I THINK EVERYONE WHO TAKES CARE OF CHILDREN SHOULD BE LICENSED."
(WEIGHTED PERCENTS BASED ON ALL HOUSEHOLDS)

	STRONGLY AGREE	AGREE	NEUTRAL (NEITHER)	DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE	NO OPINION	TOTAL WEIGHTED	RAW
BY CURRENT MARITAL STATUS:								
MARRIED	10.6	13.7	15.1	50.4	7.7	2.5	20027	3435
NOT MARRIED	9.7	19.6	18.8	42.5	7.0	2.5	4342	1171
BY RESPONDENTS EMPLOYMENT STATUS:								
EMPLOYED(FULL/PART)	9.9	14.9	18.5	46.6	7.7	2.3	8934	1761
NOT EMPLOYED	10.7	14.7	14.2	50.4	7.5	2.5	15375	2835
BY RACE/ETNICITY:								
WHITE	9.7	13.0	15.5	51.3	8.2	2.3	18312	2543
BLACK	10.1	20.6	18.0	42.4	6.5	2.4	3507	1408
SPANISH/OTHER	16.1	19.0	15.0	41.2	4.6	4.1	2571	657
BY POVERTY STATUS:								
BELOW POVERTY	8.7	19.2	17.1	45.2	6.8	3.0	3212	856
WITHIN 200% OF	10.2	14.1	15.2	50.1	7.8	2.6	5285	1189
ABOVE 200% OF POV.	11.1	14.2	15.8	50.0	7.5	1.4	13127	2036
A L L RESPONDENTS	10.4	14.8	15.8	49.1	7.5	2.4	24390	4609

UNCO

The proportion answering "yes" can be considered to be very high given that a majority opposes universal licensure. It is not unreasonable to speculate that many respondents meant their own criteria not public requirements and did not equate the concept of "requirements" with that of licensing. Others may have felt that requirements would be acceptable to them even though they would not impose requirements on the public as a whole through licensure. Still others probably excepted occasional or casual babysitting in their interpretations. In any event, it can probably be inferred that a large portion of the population feels that babysitting, if used substantially, is not an unskilled vocation for which no particular standards should be observed whether such standards are under public auspices or in the domain of parental judgment.

Respondents using in-home care by non-relatives as their main method were less likely to answer "yes." Only 35% of this group felt that sitters should have to meet "standards" (versus 45% of the whole sample), with 60.5% responding "no" and 4.6% undecided.

Respondents using some form of care outside the nuclear family (just under two thirds of the sample) were asked which of nine possible aspects of care should be regulated by standards. This question was first asked regarding "care in someone else's home" and then again for care in day care centers and nursery schools (Table 6-15).

Clearly, there is widespread support among both users in general and users of nursery schools and day care centers for regulating institutional care. Less than 1% of those responding felt that none of the aspects listed should be regulated, and even the lowest ratings (69% and 73%, respectively, for counseling and referral services) represent strong majorities despite the fact that many respondents may have been commenting on the appropriateness

TABLE 6-15

Percent Agreeing that Various Aspects of Care Should Be Regulated in Other Persons' Homes and Day Care Centers or Nursery Schools by Type of User and Type of Care

Regulatory Aspect	-In Someone Else's Home-		-In Centers or Nursery Schools-	
	Respondents Using Some Form of Care	Users of care in Non-Relatives Homes as Main Method	Respondents Using Some Form of Care	Users of Nurseries or Centers as Main Method
Fire and building safety	67.4	62.7	93.8	93.8
Cleanliness and sanitation of facilities	78.5	75.7	94.1	94.9
Number of children per responsible adult	62.2	60.3	85.8	91.0
Training and qualifications of staff	44.1	38.8	88.5	89.2
Food and Nutrition	63.3	61.8	87.7	89.5
Program content and activities	36.4	33.5	80.7	84.5
Space per child and physical surroundings and equipment	46.7	44.7	81.3	86.6
Counseling and referral services for family and child problems	25.6	20.3	69.1	73.4
Health conditions of staff and children	59.2	56.2	88.9	87.5
BASE, USERS	(100.0)	(100.0)	(100.0)	(100.0)

of the services as opposed to the need for regulation where provided. About 60% felt that all of the aspects listed should be regulated.

It is interesting to note that respondents using centers or nursery schools as their main method were slightly more likely to support most regulatory activities. However, there are two reasons why these differences are not remarkable. First, as we have seen above, center users particularly include virtually no "purist conservatives" (i.e., opposed to any government intervention at all). Second, this subpopulation includes only about 6% of the sample and the observed differences cannot be considered statistically strong. At the risk of making the infamous "Type II Error" (concluding that things are the same because differences are not statistically strong enough) it can be maintained that those using centers and nursery schools feel about the same as users as a whole.

Neither did users of care in other persons' homes differ widely from all users in their opinions on the regulation of family day care homes, but the direction of differences is interesting. That is, users of care in other homes by non-relatives were less likely to support the various regulatory aspects than were users of all the methods.

Obviously, the regulation of care in homes is much more controversial than care in centers. About 13% felt that none of the aspects should be regulated, and only in the case of "cleanliness and sanitation" is a strong affirmative majority evident. The second most popular aspect was "fire and building safety" supported by about two-thirds of all "users."

It is important to keep in mind that these two aspects are already regulated in most communities by agencies other than child welfare or child-care-related departments. Thus, respondents selecting these two items, as well as "food and nutrition" and "health conditions," may simply support usual zoning laws, building codes, health regulations, public nuisance laws and the like and might not be in favor of licensing standards focused on child care and administered by child welfare departments.

Two questionnaire categories, "number of children per responsible adult" and "program content and activities" offer insight into the range of opinion. The fact that three fifths (62.2% and 60.3%) agreed that some form of regulation on child-staff ratios should exist can probably be interpreted to mean that about this proportion support specific regulation of home-based child care. On the other hand only one in three users of this type of care thought that "program content and activities" should be regulated, indicating that only a minority supports the more subjective regulatory activities relating to how child care "programs" should be planned and operated.

Adult to Child Ratios

The issue of what minimum ratios between adults and children should be imposed, if any, for Federally-purchased care is a most controversial one particularly since the costs of care are inextricably linked to the "productivity" of providers and staff. The Title XX amendments to Federal Interagency Day Care Requirements (FIDCR) staff/child ratios for centers and group homes are given as Table 6-16.

Family Day Care Homes serving up to six children are required to maintain a ratio of at least one adult per each six children between three and 14. Where children under three are present, a one-to-five ratio is required, and providers may not serve more than two children under age two.

TABLE 6-16

FIDCR Adult to Child Minimum Ratios for Group Homes (7-12 children) and Centers

Age of Children	Adult: Child Ratio
Under 6 weeks	1:1
6 weeks up to 3 years	1:4
3 years up to 4 years	1:5
4 years up to 6 years	1:7
6 years up to 9 years	1:15
9 years up to 14 years	1:20

Respondents having children under three, between three and five, between six and nine or ten through 13 were asked:

> "We would like to talk to you about the number of children a responsible adult can reasonably handle. If you placed your child age(s) (0-2), (3-5), (6-9), (10-13) in someone else's home and assuming that the home and caregiver are acceptable, how many children altogether should this person be able to care for?"
>
> and
>
> "If you placed your child age(s) (0-2), (3-5), (6-9), (10-13) in a day care center, nursery school, or before or after school program, again assuming that the facilities and staff are acceptable, what is the largest number of other children per adult you would accept?"

Frequency distributions in response to these questions are given in Tables 6-17 through 6-24. In each of these tables, the first column gives the distribution for all parents having children in the respective age groups. The second column is limited to those currently using the specified method of care

TABLE 6-17

OPINIONS OF PARENTS WITH CHILDREN BETWEEN 0 AND 2 ON ACCEPTABLE ADULT TO CHILD RATIOS FOR 0 TO 2 YEAR OLDS IN OTHER PESON'S HOMES BY EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT (PERCENT DISTRIBUTION)

CHILDREN PER ADULT	TOTAL	USERS ONLY:	LESS THAN HS GRADUATE	HIGH SCHOOL GRADUATE	AT LEAST SOME COLLEGE
1 -1	7.8	5.5	9.3	9.4	5.9
2 -3	47.4	43.9	51.0	47.7	45.6
4 -5	31.6	34.6	23.8	30.9	35.1
6 -7	7.7	11.2	7.1	7.2	8.4
8 -9	3.3	2.2	5.4	1.9	3.7
10-11	1.3	1.3	3.1	1.4	0.6
12-13	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.1
14-15	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.1
16-17	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
18-19	0.4	0.5	0.0	0.5	0.4
20-21	0.1	0.2	0.0	0.2	0.0
22 & UP	0.2	0.4	0.0	0.5	0.0
TOTAL	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

TABLE 6-18

OPINIONS OF PARENTS WITH CHILDREN BETWEEN 3 AND 5 ON ACCEPTABLE ADULT TO CHILD RATIOS FOR 3 TC 5 YEAR OLDS IN OTHER PESON'S HOMES BY EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT (PERCENT DISTRIBUTION)

CHILDREN PER ADULT	TOTAL	USERS ONLY:	LESS THAN HS GRADUATE	HIGH SCHOOL GRADUATE	AT LEAST SOME COLLEGE
1 -1	1.9	0.4	3.4	3.0	0.5
2 -3	21.2	17.2	23.4	23.6	18.3
4 -5	44.2	46.4	42.5	45.8	43.4
6 -7	15.0	16.9	14.7	12.1	17.6
8 -9	8.1	10.8	3.6	6.6	11.1
10-11	6.7	5.9	8.4	6.0	6.6
12-13	0.9	0.2	2.1	0.8	0.6
14-15	0.9	1.8	0.5	0.8	1.0
16-17	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.3	0.0
18-19	0.6	0.1	0.6	0.3	0.8
20-21	0.1	0.0	0.5	0.1	0.0
22 & UP	0.3	0.4	0.3	0.7	0.0
TOTAL	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

UNCO

TABLE 6-19

OPINIONS OF PARENTS WITH CHILDREN BETWEEN 6 ANC 9 ON ACCEPTABLE ADULT TO CHILD RATICS FOR 6 TO 9 YEAR OLDS IN OTHER PESON'S HCMES BY EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT (PERCENT DISTRIBUTICN)

CHILDREN PER ADULT	TOTAL	USERS ONLY:	LESS THAN HS GRADUATE	HIGH SCHOOL GRADUATE	AT LEAST SCME COLLEGE
1 -1	0.2	0.0	0.8	0.2	0.0
2 -3	13.2	10.0	13.9	15.1	10.6
4 -5	36.9	38.5	40.1	38.6	33.0
6 -7	21.1	18.6	18.8	20.8	22.7
8 -9	12.6	13.3	8.9	9.7	18.2
10-11	8.9	12.3	10.4	8.0	8.9
12-13	1.9	1.8	1.3	3.0	1.1
14-15	2.6	2.8	2.2	2.0	3.6
16-17	0.1	0.2	0.0	0.0	0.2
18-19	1.1	1.9	0.6	1.6	0.8
20-21	0.3	0.0	0.4	0.1	0.4
22 & UP	1.1	0.6	2.6	0.8	0.5
TOTAL	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

UNCO

TABLE 6-20

OPINIONS OF PARENTS WITH CHILDREN BETWEEN 10 AND 13 ON ACCEPTABLE ADULT TO CHILD RATIOS FOR 10 TO 13 YEAR OLDS IN OTHER PESON'S HOMES BY EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT (PERCENT DISTRIBUTION)

CHILDREN PER ADULT	TOTAL	USERS ONLY:	LESS THAN HS GRADUATE	HIGH SCHOOL GRADUATE	AT LEAST SOME COLLEGE
1 -1	0.7	0.3	1.3	0.0	1.0
2 -3	10.4	5.9	12.1	11.7	7.7
4 -5	27.9	33.0	28.6	29.9	24.8
6 -7	19.2	16.5	17.0	20.3	19.5
8 -9	11.1	12.8	12.9	11.2	9.6
10-11	16.9	17.5	16.8	15.8	18.3
12-13	4.2	4.7	2.5	4.1	5.6
14-15	5.2	5.9	3.1	3.6	8.9
16-17	0.1	0.1	0.3	0.0	0.0
18-19	1.7	1.3	1.3	1.3	2.5
20-21	1.0	0.0	1.3	0.9	0.9
22 & UP	1.6	2.1	2.8	1.1	1.3
TOTAL	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

UNCO

TABLE 6-21

OPINIONS OF PARENTS WITH CHILDREN BETWEEN 0 AND 2 ON ACCEPTABLE ADULT TO CHILD RATIOS FOR 0 TO 2 YEAR OLDS IN NURSERIES OR CENTERS BY EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT (PERCENT DISTRIBUTION)

CHILDREN PER ADULT	TOTAL	USERS ONLY:	LESS THAN HS GRADUATE	HIGH SCHOOL GRADUATE	AT LEAST SOME COLLEGE
1 -1	4.1	3.1	3.1	3.5	4.9
2 -3	24.4	11.8	23.8	28.1	21.7
4 -5	36.2	37.7	34.6	36.2	36.8
6 -7	12.3	15.2	12.8	12.0	12.0
8 -9	7.9	9.4	10.1	5.8	8.9
10-11	8.5	10.3	10.0	9.6	7.1
12-13	2.6	7.8	1.7	0.9	4.4
14-15	1.6	2.7	0.6	0.7	2.8
16-17	0.0	0.1	0.2	0.0	0.0
18-19	0.8	0.9	1.1	0.9	0.6
20-21	0.7	0.4	1.2	0.6	0.6
22 & UP	0.9	0.8	0.7	1.9	0.2
TOTAL	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

UNCO

TABLE 6-22

OPINIONS OF PARENTS WITH CHILDREN BETWEEN 3 AND 5 ON ACCEPTABLE ADULT TO CHILD RATIOS FOR 3 TO 5 YEAR OLDS IN NURSERIES OR CENTERS BY EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT (PERCENT DISTRIBUTION)

CHILDREN PER ADULT	TOTAL	USERS ONLY:	LESS THAN HS GRADUATE	HIGH SCHOOL GRADUATE	AT LEAST SOME COLLEGE
1 -1	0.2	0.3	0.3	0.5	0.0
2 -3	4.6	0.4	4.1	5.7	3.8
4 -5	24.7	14.8	26.1	28.6	20.7
6 -7	16.3	14.1	14.7	16.0	16.6
8 -9	12.3	12.2	9.5	10.2	15.2
10-11	19.6	28.7	22.8	18.2	19.7
12-13	5.5	9.7	2.7	4.2	7.7
14-15	7.3	7.2	5.9	6.7	8.4
16-17	0.6	0.5	0.4	0.6	0.6
18-19	3.9	6.1	3.4	3.6	4.3
20-21	2.9	2.5	5.4	3.5	1.5
22 & UP	2.2	3.5	4.8	1.7	1.6
TOTAL	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

UNCO

TABLE 6-23

OPINIONS OF PARENTS WITH CHILDREN BETWEEN 6 AND 9 ON ACCEPTABLE ADULT TO CHILD RATIOS FOR 6 TO 9 YEAR OLDS IN NURSERIES OR CENTERS BY EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT (PERCENT DISTRIBUTION)

CHILDREN PER ADULT	TOTAL	USERS ONLY:	LESS THAN HS GRADUATE	HIGH SCHOOL GRADUATE	AT LEAST SOME COLLEGE
1 -1	0.1	0.0	0.2	0.0	0.0
2 -3	2.1	1.8	2.4	2.7	1.2
4 -5	16.0	4.3	20.7	19.1	9.6
6 -7	14.0	12.2	15.5	14.4	12.5
8 -9	12.9	7.9	12.8	10.5	15.9
10-11	20.3	26.1	16.2	22.8	20.0
12-13	6.0	10.5	3.3	5.5	8.2
14-15	11.0	10.8	10.4	9.2	13.4
16-17	1.3	2.6	1.3	0.2	2.6
18-19	4.9	8.5	5.4	5.3	4.1
20-21	5.7	5.0	3.9	5.4	7.1
22 & UP	5.7	10.3	7.8	4.9	5.5
TOTAL	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

UNCO

TABLE 6-24

OPINIONS OF PARENTS WITH CHILDREN BETWEEN 10 AND 13 ON ACCEPTABLE ADULT TO CHILD RATIOS FOR 10 TO 13 YEAR OLDS IN NURSERIES OR CENTERS BY EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT (PERCENT DISTRIBUTION)

CHILDREN PER ADULT	TOTAL	USERS ONLY:	LESS THAN HS GRADUATE	HIGH SCHOOL GRADUATE	AT LEAST SOME COLLEGE
1 -1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
2 -3	1.3	0.0	2.1	0.7	1.3
4 -5	11.4	9.8	12.1	14.2	7.4
6 -7	12.0	5.5	15.0	10.6	11.2
8 -9	9.4	8.6	11.0	11.4	5.7
10-11	21.2	17.1	20.0	23.9	18.7
12-13	7.9	2.2	9.5	8.9	5.6
14-15	10.5	13.1	7.9	9.2	14.2
16-17	1.9	0.0	2.7	0.4	3.1
18-19	6.1	16.0	4.5	4.5	9.4
20-21	8.5	11.9	5.8	7.9	11.4
22 & UP	9.8	15.8	9.3	8.3	12.0
TOTAL	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

UNCO

(i.e., either care in a non-relative's home or day care center/nursery school). Columns three, four and five give distributions by respondents' highest levels of education attained and are not limited to users.

Interestingly, users were more "lenient" than non-users in their opinions. Perhaps this is because users, having actually seen professionals at work, are more confident of the abilities of experienced providers to manage several children at once in a routine or planned program; whereas non-users may tend to take the personal perspective (e.g., How many might I be able to manage?). Or, the slightly higher ratios given by users may reflect current reality rather than the ideal situation.

Although the data in Tables 6-17 through 6-18 are not strictly comparable with the FIDCR requirements, it can be said that there is substantial concordance between the opinions of mothers and the regulations for Family Day Care Homes particularly since a certain amount of sheer ignorance and misinterpretation can be expected from a question forcing response (i.e., "don't know" was not solicited).*

In contrast, opinions on staff to child ratios for day care centers and nursery schools serving pre-schoolers were much less stringent (Tables 6-21 through 6-24). Of perhaps greatest importance are the opinions of nursery school and center users who prescribed ratios substantially lower than the FIDCR.

---

*For example, the small proportions giving ratios of over 1:20 for infants and pre-schoolers probably include respondents envisioning a school-type setting.